




Class D16

Book H66

Copyright N^o _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.






International Education Series

EDITED BY

WILLIAM T. HARRIS, A. M., LL. D.

VOLUME XXV.



THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION SERIES.

12mo, cloth, uniform binding.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION SERIES was projected for the purpose of bringing together in orderly arrangement the best writings, new and old, upon educational subjects, and presenting a complete course of reading and training for teachers generally. It is edited by W. T. HARRIS, LL. D., now United States Commissioner of Education, who has contributed for the different volumes in the way of introductions, analysis, and commentary. The volumes are tastefully and substantially bound in uniform style.

VOLUMES NOW READY:

- Vol. I.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION. By JOHANN KARL FRIEDRICH ROSENKRANZ, Doctor of Theology and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Königsberg. Translated from the German by ANNA C. BRACKETT. Second edition, revised, and accompanied with Commentary and complete Analysis. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. II.—A HISTORY OF EDUCATION. By F. V. N. PAINTER, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Roanoke College, Va. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. III.—THE RISE AND EARLY CONSTITUTION OF UNIVERSITIES. WITH A SURVEY OF MEDIEVAL EDUCATION. By S. S. LAURIE, LL. D., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. IV.—THE VENTILATION AND WARMING OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS. By GILBERT B. MORRISON, Teacher of Physics and Chemistry in Kansas City High School. Price, \$1.00.
- Vol. V.—THE EDUCATION OF MAN. By FRIEDRICH FROEBEL. Translated and furnished with ample notes by W. N. HAILMANN, A. M., Superintendent of Public Schools, La Porte, Ind. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. VI.—ELEMENTARY PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION. By DR. J. BALDWIN, author of "The Art of School Management." Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. VII.—THE SENSES AND THE WILL. (Part I of "THE MIND OF THE CHILD.") By W. PREYER, Professor of Physiology in Jena. Translated from the original German by H. W. BROWN, Teacher in the State Normal School at Worcester, Mass. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. VIII.—MEMORY: What it is and how to Improve it. By DAVID KAY, F. R. G. S., author of "Education and Educators," etc. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. IX.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTELLECT. (Part II of "THE MIND OF THE CHILD.") By W. PREYER, Professor of Physiology in Jena. Translated from the original German by H. W. BROWN, Teacher in the State Normal School at Worcester, Mass. Price, \$1.50.

- Vol. X.—**HOW TO STUDY GEOGRAPHY.** A Practical Exposition of Methods and Devices in Teaching Geography which apply the Principles and Plans of Ritter and Guyot. By FRANCIS W. PARKER, Principal of the Cook County (Illinois) Normal School. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XI.—**EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES:** Its History from the Earliest Settlements. By RICHARD G. BOONE, A. M., Professor of Pedagogy in Indiana University. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XII.—**EUROPEAN SCHOOLS;** or, What I Saw in the Schools of Germany, France, Austria, and Switzerland. By L. R. KLEMM, Ph. D., Principal of the Cincinnati Technical School, author of "Chips from a Teacher's Workshop," etc. Fully illustrated. Price, \$2.00.
- Vol. XIII.—**PRACTICAL HINTS FOR THE TEACHERS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.** By GEORGE HOWLAND, Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools. Price, \$1.00.
- Vol. XIV.—**PESTALOZZI:** His Life and Work. By ROGER DE GUIMPS. Authorized translation from the second French edition, by J. RUSSELL, B. A., Assistant Master in University College, London. With an Introduction by Rev. R. H. QUICK, M. A. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XV.—**SCHOOL SUPERVISION.** By J. L. PICKARD, LL. D. Price, \$1.00.
- Vol. XVI.—**HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN IN EUROPE.** By HELENE LANGE, Berlin. Translated and accompanied by comparative statistics by L. R. KLEMM. Price, \$1.00.
- Vol. XVII.—**ESSAYS ON EDUCATIONAL REFORMERS.** By ROBERT HERBERT QUICK, M. A., Trinity College, Cambridge; formerly Assistant Master at Harrow, and Lecturer on the History of Education at Cambridge; late Vicar of Ledbergh. *Only authorized edition of the work as rewritten in 1890.* Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XVIII.—**A TEXT-BOOK IN PSYCHOLOGY.** AN ATTEMPT TO FOUND THE SCIENCE OF PSYCHOLOGY ON EXPERIENCE, METAPHYSICS, AND MATHEMATICS. By JOHANN FRIEDRICH HERBART. Translated from the original German by MARGARET K. SMITH, Teacher in the State Normal School at Oswego, New York. Price, \$1.00.
- Vol. XIX.—**PSYCHOLOGY APPLIED TO THE ART OF TEACHING.** By Dr. JOSEPH BALDWIN. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XX.—**ROUSSEAU'S ÉMILE.** By W. H. PAYNE. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XXI.—**THE MORAL INSTRUCTION OF CHILDREN.** By FELIX ADLER. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XXII.—**ENGLISH EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.** By ISAAC SHARPLESS, LL. D. Price, \$1.00.
- Vol. XXIII.—**EDUCATION FROM A NATIONAL STANDPOINT.** By ALFRED FOUILLÉE. Price, \$1.50.
- Vol. XXIV.—**MENTAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CHILD.** By W. PREYER. Price, \$1.00.

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers, 1, 3, & 5 Bond Street.

✓
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION SERIES

HOW TO STUDY AND TEACH HISTORY

WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE
HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

works
✓
BY

B. A. HINSDALE, PH. D., LL. D.

PROFESSOR OF THE SCIENCE AND THE ART OF TEACHING
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

AUTHOR OF


SCHOOLS AND STUDIES, THE OLD NORTHWEST, AND THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT
AND EDITOR OF THE WORKS OF JAMES ABRAM GARFIELD



52072 ✓

NEW YORK
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY

1894



COPYRIGHT, 1893,
BY D. APPLETON AND COMPANY.

ELECTROTYPED AND PRINTED
AT THE APPLETON PRESS, U. S. A.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE present volume belongs to the fourth division of works included in this series. It relates to the art of education, and comes under the first subdivision of that head—namely, methods of instruction.* There is no branch of educational literature of more importance than that which treats of methods of instruction. I might add, too, that the method of teaching history, as contrasted with the methods of teaching mathematics or geology, or other branches of natural science, even including biology, has a peculiar importance of its own. For history deals with the will power of man and moves chiefly in the province of motives and purposes, and only secondarily in the province of mere mechanical causation.

While it is important to study the theater of action and to understand the problems presented by land and water, by mountain ranges, deserts, rivers, climates, and

* The scheme includes works under four general heads:

I. History of Education.

II. Criticisms of Education, mostly written by educational reformers.

III. Systematic Works presenting the Theory of Education.

IV. Art or Practice of Education.

The fourth division—Art or Practice—includes: (1) Books on the method of instruction; (2) On methods of government and discipline; (3) On methods of organizing schools, etc.; (4) Supervision of schools.

soil, yet these and all circumstances of the environment belong only to the category of means and agencies which man as a self-active being has learned to use—or will learn how to use. They are the stuff which he is to work up into patterns according to his ideals. The material world is the quarry in which we may help ourselves to whatever can serve to realize our inner aims. Civilization is the conquest over material nature by the organization of human society according to ideals of justice and beneficence. Justice returns the deed upon the doer; but beneficence, philanthropy, loving-kindness, or grace, as this moral sensibility is called, seeks to bring good to the doer in place of the evil that he sends forth, and consequently prefers to accept pain and suffer from discommoding when it may thereby help an evil doer to grow into righteousness and goodness. Righteousness and goodness are the ideas that the Hebrew sacred writings have given to mankind as the essential attributes of the Divine Being. As righteous, He holds men responsible for their actions and returns their deeds upon them; as goodness, however, He shows tenderness toward sinful and erring humanity and is eternally forgiving—thus suffering and bearing evil in this world in order that He may nurture self-active beings potentially in his image into the realization of his image.

This Hebrew idea adopted into our civilization is the essence of history, because it is at once the cause of civilization and the measure of it. In proportion as a people organize institutions that realize righteousness and goodness, or what is the same thing, justice and mercy, they achieve civilization.

History is an account of this progress, and Hegel has well said, in his Introduction to the Philosophy of His-

tory, that "the theme of world history is the onward progress into the consciousness of freedom." * The steps to this insight are, first, man's self-activity; second, the religious idea that God is perfect self-activity; third, that perfect self-activity is moral; † fourth, moral freedom, being the divine form and image, man's destiny is to grow into it; and hence, fifth, the measure of progress in history is this development into the consciousness of freedom, or into clear insight into what is divine and eternal, and the *use* of the earth to celebrate this consciousness and make it perpetual. For this consciousness can never be fully achieved except through the conquest of nature for spiritual uses; nor except through a completed natural science which will reveal all provinces of matter and force and life as progressive steps in the development of free individuality—mineral, plant, animal, man, being the four chief stadia. The world in time and space, according to this religious theory, is a cradle for the nurture of free beings, beginning so low down as to include insensate rocks and the very ether itself.

I have mentioned purposely this religious ideal in order to bring out in sharpest contrast that view of history which delights to ally it most closely with natural science, and to find the explanation of all human events in the structure and forces of the material environment. According to the materialistic school of historians there is no such thing as free will; each being is determined to be what he is by the totality of conditions.

* Page 24, 3d ed.: "Die Weltgeschichte ist der Fortschritt im Bewusstseyn der Freiheit."

† The law of morality is to act in such a way that one's deed does not infringe on the freedom or self-activity of others; any such infringement would be self-contradiction, and would be self-destructive in the end.

I am not disparaging the study of man's environment, however, but only pointing out the extremes to which the reaction against the former somewhat abstract view has led. The old theory was made by men intoxicated with the great idea of individual freedom, and as a consequence it slighted the material factor of civilization. It was reluctant to admit the existence of such a factor. The reaction that has set in from the province of natural science proposes to ignore man's freedom and take account only of the determining circumstance, which surround individuals and groups of men.

This contradiction is not, however, difficult to reconcile. Looking at the goal of human progress it is easy to see that man is on his way to conquer and reduce to his service the powers and products of Nature. The amount of human energy expended in compelling Nature to his use is far greater than that expended directly in attaining consciousness of himself and in realizing moral self-control. Man works for food, clothing, and shelter far more hours than for science, art, religion, and civil government.

He therefore spends most of his energy in reacting against his material environments, and is thus said to be enslaved by it. The materialists say that he is under necessity. But they ignore the obvious fact of self-activity. Man is acted upon, but he reacts on the external through his native energy. His reaction consists chiefly in turning out or dispossessing the control of Nature and in seizing control for his own uses. He turns Nature's forces against Nature's purposes and makes his environment acknowledge his sway.

Man's self-activity presupposes as its basis what Kant calls a transcendental freedom—a radiating center of pure

self-activity not dependent at all on anything in time and space except for its manifestation. All Nature, all facts and events, belong to the secondary order of use, but not to the primary order of free causality ; all things are for man's use, but man himself is a transcendental freedom that can dispense with the world and all that it contains by simply refraining from any act of manifestation. He can dispense with food and drink, letting his body starve ; food and drink therefore do not determine him in any such sense as his will determines him. They can come only so far as to be secondary agencies in realizing his motives.

A direct efficient cause necessitates a change in something else, but a motive or purpose (called a "final cause") does not constrain an actor or doer ; its presence in the mind is the product of one free act (namely, that of abstraction, which thinks of something else in the place of what is), and then its realization by the will is another free act, by which the soul affirms itself and encroaches on the independent existence of its environment by substituting its own purposes for those of Nature.

This factor of transcendental freedom is the soul of history, but of course it reveals itself or realizes itself only in modifying its environment to adapt it to human uses. In the frozen zone the Eskimo has fashioned himself a hut of snow and ice, using the product of cold to exclude the cold. The environment does not create the food, clothing, and shelter of the Eskimo. It is he, the self-active, who has reacted against it and forced various products out of their natural purposes into his own. Given his environment, and we can see and measure his amount of reaction against it—we can see how much he has conquered it. His conquest is the measure of his en-

ergy, and relatively the measure of the resistance to human energy.

But in proportion to man's inner development of ideas he is able to advance in the conquest of the environment and usurp the natural directive forces of the physical world.

With the reactive power of the Algonquin tribes the use of the environment was inconsiderable compared with that of the Anglo-Saxon. An ocean as an environment excluded the savage, but it was a good road to the European.

When man acts on Nature his products have two factors—the natural stuff or material and the modification or use forced on it by human will. The former factor is contributed by the environment, the second factor arises in “transcendental freedom.”

Now it is evident that history has two researches to make, the first one an inventory of the environment, as complete as may be made of its things and forces; the second, an inventory of the people, including physical and intellectual traits and ideals.

The antecedents of the American settlers had already revealed in Europe what degree of reaction they possessed against environments of land, water, and climate. It had shown their ideals and their command of means to realize them. It had shown the growth of those ideals through the gradual assimilation of the purely spiritual ideas derived from the Hebrew Scriptures, the Greek literature, and the Roman political and social forms.

A civilization has its highest phase in the religious convictions of its people, revealed in its church, its literature, and its science; its second phase in the political form of the nation, including its legislative, executive,

and judicial functions. The third phase of its civilization next in order from the highest is its industrial system and its method of utilizing the features of its material environment not merely for food, clothing, and shelter, but more especially for rapid and frequent intercommunication between its own citizens and with foreign peoples collecting and diffusing knowledge.

The geographical environment of the American continent has not materially modified the development of civilization already on its course of evolution when the emigrants were leaving their European homes for this country; we have developed further the ideas of Protestant Englishmen, Dutchmen, Germans, and French Huguenots of the seventeenth century, and we have taught their ideas to other immigrants that have come to live among us. We have gladly availed ourselves of the discoveries of science to carry forward the conquest of Nature and make it an indifferent matter where the citizen makes his home; whether North or South, East or West, he can command the productions of all sections and of all the world at a very cheap rate, thanks to the aid of steam on railroad and river.

In fact no civilization was ever before so indifferent to its natural environment, and so confident in its ability to create an environment of its choice.

The study of the environment has therefore become a sort of inventory of products of Nature which are to serve as raw material for human ingenuity to transmute into articles of use. Moreover, our civilization is continually lessening the effect of our immediate environment by making present all distant environments through the machinery of transportation.

History is a window of the soul, as I have often called

it,* that looks out upon the deeds of the race. It shows man engaged in the work of revealing what is essential in his inward nature and what he makes real in his institutions—the family, civil society, the state, the Church.

The study of our own national history is first in order, but it can not be carried very far without involving us in the great European movements that led to the discovery and colonization of America. Nor can mediæval or modern European history be understood except through an investigation of the three peoples—Greeks, Romans, and Hebrews—that furnish the three strands which combine to make modern civilization.

In the work of Dr. Hinsdale before us the reader will find the safe guidance of an author who honors and appreciates at their true value the two factors of history, the material and the spiritual. The teacher will derive essential assistance from the hints which crowd its pages, pointing out the discriminating marks that enable him to select the significant and to pass lightly over the unimportant.

W. T. HARRIS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 2, 1893.*

* How to Study Geography (in this series), Editor's preface, p. vii.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

THE last generation has seen a great growth of interest in history, and particularly so in the United States. Evidences of this fact are the increased production of historical literature of all kinds, the application of more scientific methods to historical investigation, the growth of historical societies in number, prosperity, and influence, and especially the greatly augmented attention that is given to history as a branch of general education.

The change in the colleges and universities is very marked. A college or university can not be named that, thirty years ago, employed a single professor exclusively in historical teaching; now there are a number of such institutions that require the united labors of several men to do the work. There has been a similar if not an equal growth of interest in the secondary and elementary schools. In fact, it was only a few years ago that the States first began to put the History of the United States on the list of studies required to be taught in the common schools.

Nor is the change made in the schools limited to the quantity of the work that is done; in respect to subject-matter and methods of teaching it is perhaps equally pronounced. Here, however, there is reason to think that the gain is greater in the higher schools than in the lower ones. At least, it is the general opinion of competent

judges that history is one of the studies that are poorly taught, as a rule, in the schools below the college. The reasons for this appear to be that only a short time has elapsed since the new emphasis was placed upon the subject, that it is commonly taught by teachers who are not prepared for the work (on the theory that almost anybody can teach history), and that history presents some peculiar difficulties to the teacher.

The aim of this book is practical. In writing it, I have sought to help students and teachers who will read it with attention. It is not indeed practical in the narrow mechanical sense of the word; no effort is made to tell the teacher *just what* he shall teach or *just how* he shall teach it. The aim is rather to state the uses of history, to define in a general way its field, to present and to illustrate criteria for the choice of facts, to emphasize the organization of facts with reference to the three principles of association, to indicate sources of information, to describe the qualifications of the teacher, and finally to illustrate causation and the grouping of facts by drawing the outlines of some important chapters of American history. If it be objected to these studies that they belong to history itself rather than to a book on teaching history, the obvious reply is that they make the subject more concrete. The frequent criticism on pedagogical books and lectures, that they are general and abstract, often betrays a low mental plane on the part of the critic, but this is not always the case. There can be no question that even good teachers, in such discussions as the present one, require a great deal of concrete illustration.

While the book contains much matter that should, in my opinion, interest teachers of history in colleges, I have written it with the needs of elementary and secondary

teachers more particularly in mind. Others will decide upon my success; but I may fairly plead as qualifications for writing it a considerable knowledge of students and teachers gained in schools and institutes, some patient study of history itself and some experience in teaching it, some attention to its pedagogical aspects, and particularly some service as a lecturer on teaching history in institutes, summer schools, and in the college and university.

It has not been found possible so to divide the subject as wholly to avoid touching more than once upon certain parts of it. Such, however, is the value of reasonable iteration that this can hardly be urged as a fair criticism.

B. A. HINSDALE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
October 26, 1893.



GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

REFERENCES will be found accompanying the successive chapters. It is thought best, however, to present a general bibliography, comprising for the most part works of a general character to which it is desirable that teachers of history should have constant access. The bibliographies preceding the chapters relate to special subjects.

While the English language is very rich in historical literature, it is comparatively poor in works relating to the study and teaching of history. For example, of the sixty-eight numbered titles found in Dr. Hall's Bibliography of Education under the head of History and Political Science, only some twenty are in English, while a majority of these are either manuals, guides, or articles prepared for the periodical press. In fact, most of the pedagogical literature relating to the subject must be sought in magazines, educational journals, pamphlets, and proceedings of educational associations. Upon the whole, it must be said that the professional literature relating to the subject is now rapidly increasing.

I. C. K. ADAMS.—A Manual of Historical Literature. Comprising Brief Descriptions of the Most Important Histories in English, French, and German, together with Practical Suggestions as to Methods and Courses of Historical Study, for the use of Students, General Readers, and Collectors of Books. Omitting the subheads, the chapters are entitled: Introduction, On the Study of History, Universal Histories, Histories of Antiquity, Histories of Greece, of Rome, of the Middle Ages, of Modern Times, of Italy, of Germany, of France, of Russia and Poland, of the Smaller Nationalities of Europe, of England, and of the United States. This work is the most valuable of its kind that American scholarship has produced.

II. H. B. ADAMS.—The Study of History in American Colleges

and Universities. A Circular of Information of the Bureau of Education. Dr. Adams aims to exhibit the origin, development, and present status of history in the colleges and universities of the United States. The institutions treated at greatest length are Harvard, Yale, Cornell, and Johns Hopkins Universities, the University of Michigan, and Columbia College, though some others are included. A chapter is devoted to history and political science in the Washington High School.

III. E. H. BUNBURY.—A History of Ancient Geography among the Greeks and Romans, from the Earliest Ages to the Fall of the Roman Empire. Two volumes, with twenty illustrative maps.

IV. DR. E. A. FREEMAN.—Few historical writers can be studied by advanced students and teachers with more advantage than Dr. Freeman. This is due in part to the diversity of his subjects, to the thoroughness of his treatment, and to the variety of forms into which he has thrown his studies, but largely to his method and style, which is always strong and clear, with plenty, and sometimes an excess, of emphasis on the main points. Viewing his works from a pedagogical standpoint, the following titles may be given: (1) The Historical Geography of Europe, 2-vols. Vol. I., Text; Vol. II., Maps. Introduction: The Geographical Aspect of Europe, The Effects of Geography on History, and The Geographical Distribution of Races. The chapters bear the following titles: Greece and the Greek Colonies, Formation of the Roman Empire, The Dismemberment of the Empire, The Final Division of the Empire, The Beginning of the Modern European States, The Ecclesiastical Geography of Western Europe, The Imperial Kingdoms, The Kingdom of France, The Eastern Empire, The Baltic Land, The Spanish Peninsula and its Colonies, and The British Islands and Colonies. The volume of maps is not properly an historical atlas, but is intended to show boundaries of states and changes of political geography. (2) Methods of Historical Study. Eight Lectures read in the University of Oxford, with an Inaugural Address entitled The Office of the Historical Professor. The subjects of the lectures are: History and its Kindred Studies, The Difficulties of Historical Study, The Nature of Historical Evidence, Original Authorities, Classical and Mediæval Writers, Subordinate Authorities, Modern Writers, and Geography and Travel. (3) Comparative Politics. Six Lectures Read before the Royal Institution. (4) The Unity of History. The Rede Lecture before the University of Cambridge. (5)

The Chief Periods of European History. (In Nos. 4 and 5 Dr. Freeman has developed his favorite ideas of historical unity and continuity.) (6) The Growth of the English Constitution. (7) Good examples of the author's method, as well as good historical work, may be found in the following essays: The Relations between the Crowns of England and Scotland, The Franks and the Gauls, The Continuity of English History, The Holy Roman Empire (First Series); Race and Language, The Byzantine Empire (Third Series); Historical Cycles and Augustan Ages, The Growth of Commonwealths, The Constitution of the German Empire, and The House of Lords (Fourth Series). Freeman's General Sketch of History is one of the best. In his essay on Lord Macaulay, Dr. Freeman remarks: "It is for others to judge whether I have learned from Macaulay the art of being clear; I at least learned from Macaulay the duty of trying to be clear." He says he learned of him that to be clear a writer must (1) "avoid involved, complicated, parenthetical sentences"; (2) "avoid sentences crowded with relatives and participles"; (3) and, upon this he lays great stress, "never to be afraid of using the same word over and over again, if by that means anything could be added to clearness or force." He very justly remarks that Macaulay "never goes on, like some writers, talking about the 'former' and the 'latter,' 'he,' 'she,' 'it,' and 'they,' through clause after clause, while his reader has to look back to see which of several persons it is that is so referred to." He might have added, with equal truth, that Macaulay never, like Gibbon, writes history allusively, assuming that the reader has the facts already in his possession, and that it is the author's business merely to discourse or comment upon them; but that, on the other hand, Macaulay always looks his facts squarely in the face, and proceeds to state them in a straightforward manner, a virtue that is also exemplified by Dr. Freeman himself.

V. H. GANNETT.—Boundaries of the United States and of the Several States and Territories, with a Historical Sketch of the Territorial Changes. Bulletin of the United States Geological Survey, No. 13.

VI. S. R. GARDINER.—A School Atlas of English History.

VII. G. S. HALL.—Methods of Teaching History. The first edition of this work contained Dr. Diesterweg's valuable treatise, *Instruction in History*, but it has been excluded from the revised edition, and is now published separately. The contents of the book are

the following: Introduction, Methods of Teaching American History, Practical Methods in Higher Historical Instruction, On Methods of teaching Political Economy, Historical Instruction in the Course of History and Political Science at Cornell University, Advice to an Inexperienced Teacher, A Plea for Archæological Instruction, The Use of a Public Library in the Study of History, Special Methods of Historical Study, The Philosophy of the State and of History, The Course of Study in History, Roman Law, and Political Economy at Harvard University, The Teaching of History, On Methods of teaching History, On Methods of Historical Study and Research in Columbia University, Physical Geography and History, Why do Children dislike History? Gradation and Topical Method of Historical Study, Part I., Historical Literature and Authorities, Part II., Books for Collateral Reading, Part III., School Text-Books, Supplement, History Topics, Bibliography of Church History. These chapters are the work of distinguished specialists, and the book is one of great value for the student and teacher.

VIII. A. B. HART.—Epoch Maps illustrative of American History.

IX. E. F. HENDERSON.—Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.

X. ALEX. JOHNSTON.—History of American Politics. Third Edition Revised and Enlarged by Professor Sloane. A book that made its author a reputation.

XI. J. J. LALOR.—Cyclopædia of Political Science, Political Economy, and United States History. The articles on American History contributed to this Cyclopædia by the late Alexander Johnston are remarkable for clearness of insight and felicity of statement.

XII. E. LAVISSE.—General View of the Political History of Europe. An admirable book for the teacher who can grasp its bold generalizations.

XIII. T. MACCOUN.—A Historical Geography of the United States, Historical Charts of the United States.

XIV. C. PLOETZ.—Epitome of Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern History.

XV. H. W. PRESTON.—Documents illustrative of American History, 1606-1868, with Introduction and References.

XVI. F. W. PUTZGER.—Historischer Schulatlas zur Alten Mitteleren und Neuer Geschichte.

XVII. E. RECLUS.—The Earth and its Inhabitants.

XVIII. N. S. SHALER.—Nature and Man in America.

XIX. W. STUBBS.—The Study of Mediæval and Modern History. Seventeen Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford. Everything that Bishop Stubbs has written, apart from its historical value, has pedagogic merit. The following lectures may be particularized: I. Inaugural. II.–III. On the Present State and Prospects of Historical Study. IV. On the Purposes and Methods of Historical Study. V. Methods of Historical Study. VI.–VII. On the Characteristic Differences between Mediæval and Modern History.

XX. J. WINSOR.—Narrative and Critical History of America: Vol. I. Aboriginal America. II. Spanish Explorations and Settlements from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century. III. English Explorations and Settlements in North America, 1497–1689. IV. French Explorations and Settlements in North America, and those of the Portuguese, Dutch, and Swedes, 1500–1700. V. The English and French in North America, 1689–1763. VI.–VII. The United States of North America. VIII. The Later History of British, Spanish, and Portuguese America. This monumental work, prepared by specialists on the co-operative plan, is less valuable for its narrative than for its critical portions. For students who can handle such an apparatus, its critical essays, bibliographies, catalogues and descriptions of maps, and editorial notes are invaluable.

Had I seen W. J. Ashley: An Historical Introduction to English Economic History and Theory, The Middle Ages, and Part II., The End of the Middle Ages, before writing Chapter III., I should have mentioned those excellent works in that place. I can only regret that Winsor: Cartier to Frontenac, a Study of Geographical Discovery in the Interior of North America in its Historical Relations, 1534–1700; with full Cartographical Illustrations from Contemporary Sources, announced but not yet published, some of the proof sheets of which I have been permitted to examine, did not appear before my own book was written. It will no doubt meet a felt want of students in American history.

Reviewing Chapter III. now that it is stereotyped, I am impressed that not enough is there said of the value to teachers of history of pictures and other graphical illustrations, maps excepted. A well-chosen stock of photographs or plates of historical places, monuments, scenes, buildings, works of art, and men, can be used to excellent advantage, particularly in the early stages of historical study and teaching. The same may be said of casts and models as of

statuary and buildings. Pictures in a book even have their value. That excellent writer Professor Alexander Johnston was certainly in error when he protested that "maps in abundance" are the "only legitimate embellishment of a school history." For an example of what pictures may do for an historical work that admits of such illustration, I may refer to the illustrated edition of Green's Short History of the English People, which has been prepared in accordance with the wish of its author to have "English history interpreted and illustrated by pictures which should let us see how men and things appeared to the lookers-on of their own day, and how contemporary observers aimed at representing them." This idea has been carried out by the editors with excellent judgment and taste as far as the publication of the edition has proceeded, with the result that The Short History is now a "pictured page" in a double sense.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
EDITOR'S PREFACE	v
AUTHOR'S PREFACE	xiii
I.—THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF HISTORY	1
II.—THE FIELD OF HISTORY	18
III.—SOURCES OF INFORMATION.	27
IV.—THE CHOICE OF FACTS	42
V.—METHODS OF TEACHING	53
VI.—THE ORGANIZATION OF FACTS	67
VII.—THE TIME RELATION IN HISTORY: CHRONOLOGY	75
VIII.—THE PLACE RELATION: GEOGRAPHY	92
IX.—CAUSE AND EFFECT IN HISTORY	101
X.—PHYSICAL CAUSES THAT ACT IN HISTORY	110
XI.—HUMAN CAUSES THAT ACT IN HISTORY	127
XII.—THE TEACHER'S QUALIFICATIONS	138
XIII.—HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY: THE OLD WORLD	153
XIV.—HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY: THE NEW WORLD	174
XV.—NORTH AMERICA IN OUTLINE	192
XVI.—THE COLONIZATION OF NORTH AMERICA	204
XVII.—THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN NORTH AMERICA	219
XVIII.—A CONSPECTUS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION	231
XIX.—THE WAR OF 1812	245
XX.—THE TERRITORIAL GROWTH OF THE UNITED STATES	253
XXI.—PHASES OF INDUSTRIAL AND POLITICAL DEVELOP- MENT	277
XXII.—THE SLAVE POWER	297
XXIII.—TEACHING CIVICS	314

HOW TO STUDY AND TEACH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF HISTORY.

References.—Formal discussions of the educational value of history, or at least thorough ones, are hardly to be found in the English language. Valuable remarks, however, will be found in the following sources:

Bolingbroke: Letters on the Study and Use of History; Diesterweg: Instruction in History (I. The Meaning of History, II. On the Use of History); Milton: Tractate on Education; Locke: Thoughts on Education; Carlyle: Critical and Miscellaneous Essays (History); Macaulay: Critical and Miscellaneous Essays (History, Hallam's Constitutional History of Europe, Mackintosh's History of the Revolution in England, 1688, and Mitford's History of Greece); John Morley: Critical Miscellanies, Second Series (Popular Culture); Emerson: Essays (History); Dr. Thomas Arnold: Lectures on Modern History (Inaugural Lecture); Lecky: The Political Value of History, A Lecture; Spencer: Education (I. What Knowledge is of most Worth?); Wells: The Teaching of History in Schools, An Oxford Extension Lecture; Stubbs: The Study of Mediæval and Modern History (see particularly I. and II.); Howell: Education, I. (History in its Relation to Practical Life); Birrell: Obiter Dicta (The Muse of History); C. K. Adams: Manual of Historical Literature (Introduction, On the Study of History); Schaff: History of the Christian Church, I. (General Introduction), History of the Apostolic Church (General Introduction to Church History); Guizot: His-

tory of Civilization (*passim*); Jay: Papers of the American Historical Association, V., Nos. 1, 2 (The Demand for Education in American History).

The pedagogical writers deal with the subject from their own point of view. Bain: Education as a Science, VIII.; Compayré: Theoretical and Practical Pedagogy, Part II., Chap. V.; Currie: Principles and Practice of Common School Education, XII.; Fitch: Lectures on Teaching, XIII.; Klemm: European Schools, II., III.

WHY should we teach the history of the United States in the schools of the country? The question is part of a larger one, Why teach history at all? And this question can not be answered without taking some account of the uses and values of studies in general. These may be divided into four groups.

First, the instrumental studies are those that are used in carrying on other studies and in other similar mental work. Writing is an instrument of impartation, and also an instrument of record. It is the art preservative of arts. Reading, on the other hand, is an art of acquirement. It unlocks the printed page. Notation, numeration, and the other fundamental rules of arithmetic are also instrumental; and the same may be said of drawing, musical notation, and the various kinds of symbolism employed for different purposes. These studies or arts have a certain value in themselves, but they are primarily tools for further acquisition or impartation.

Secondly, some studies give us knowledge that is directly useful in practical affairs. These are the guidance or information studies. While the instrumental studies look to further acquirement, these find their uses in the duties and activities of real life. As far as they go, they tell us what to do and what not to do. They inform the mind. Some of them are preparatory to other studies, but this is only a secondary reason for carrying them on. They all have disciplinary value, but this fact does not determine their classification. Into this group fall such studies as geography, physiology and hygiene, and many more.

Thirdly, the disciplinary studies exercise and so develop or strengthen the mental powers. Some of them lead on to other studies, as arithmetic to algebra; but they are not pursued primarily for this reason. Some of them have guidance value, but this is not their characteristic function. The disciplines form the mind, and this fact determines their classification. Into this group fall the mathematics, science, and language.

Fourthly, culture is the slowly maturing fruit of a silent feeding of the soul upon nourishing ideas. While discipline looks to volume of mental power, culture looks to its kind. Culture is the tone of power rather than its amount or intensity. It is a qualitative rather than a quantitative word. And the culture studies are those that conduce to such results. Literature and art are typical studies of this group.

Of the many remarks that this mapping out of studies suggests, perhaps the most obvious is that the several groups overlap one another. There is discipline in the instrumental and information studies; information and guidance in the disciplinary studies; and so on. In fact, if we were to make a close analysis, we should base it on the elements of studies rather than on studies considered as units. A further observation is that studies belonging to the same group are by no means equal in respect to the amount of value that they possess. They differ widely in this respect. It should also be remarked that the value of a study is relative to the pupil, as respects both the character of his mind and his stage of mental advancement. One person may get most discipline, for example, out of science, another most out of language; while arithmetic belongs to an early stage of mathematical study, calculus to a late one. But the discussion of these questions belongs to a treatise on Educational Values. The division of studies into the instrumental, the disciplinary, the guidance, and the culture groups, with the explanatory observations offered, is all-sufficient for the present purpose.

The further observation should be added that man's na-

ture is complex ; he has not merely an intellect to be formed and furnished, but also a sensibility to be affected and a will to be energized.

It is now necessary to test history by these criteria—in other words, to determine the nature of its effects upon the mind. Nor will this be sufficient ; we must also estimate, approximately at least, the amount or quantity of educational value wherever it arises. But properly to reach these ends we must consider what history is.

1. The staple or subject-matter is facts. This staple does not differ in kind from the “ practical knowledge ” or “ useful information ” so much prized by the practical man. Serviceable knowledge about the things going on in the world when picked up by observation, gleaned from the press, or gathered in conversation, is what Dr. Fitch calls “ fact lore ” ; similar knowledge of what has gone on in the world, when learned from books and not from tradition, is history. A journal or newspaper presents a transcript of current life, a history a transcript of past life.

History, then, deals with man in his proper human sphere or capacity. It is knowledge of the workings of his intellect, feelings, and will, especially as these workings reveal themselves in objective facts—laws, cities, battles, religions, and the like. It is therefore moral knowledge—knowledge of the play and activity of man’s spiritual nature.

Evidently, there is the widest difference between history and mathematics or logic in two respects. The first in its elementary form is a fact study ; the other two begin with definitions and axioms and proceed by logical deduction. History moves in the all-important field of moral freedom ; mathematics and logic, in the field of necessary inference.

2. Historical material must be elaborated and combined. Historical facts by themselves are not history. They must be worked up ; or, to use a better figure, they must be organized—that is, be brought together and integrated with reference to their relations.

3. History also tests its own results ; it seeks to verify

its own facts and conclusions. In order to do this, it must take account of its methods and processes of investigation. The reflective treatment of historical method falls, indeed, to the philosopher; but its essential nature and practical application must also engage the attention of the historical student.

I. From the foregoing account it is manifest that history has great guidance value. As information, we may well hesitate before we assign to any school study a higher rank. In a great number and variety of matters experience is the lamp to a man's feet and the guide to his path. No doubt oral knowledge immediately influences his conduct to a greater degree; but in the long run history is the great channel that conveys to him the past experiences of the race. In politics, in religion,* in morals, in education, and in economical, social, and industrial life it is indispensable. This is why Cicero called history "the witness of times, the light of truth, and the mistress of life"; and why Diodorus styled it "a handmaid of Providence, a priestess of truth, and a mother of life." Hereafter something will be said of the periods, epochs, and ages of history, and of the profound influence that the idea of evolution has recently exerted in modifying the ways in which it is written and taught; here it is necessary to observe that no man, or generation, or nation begins life anew, but that historical movement is necessarily uninterrupted and continuous. In the words of Dr. Schaff: "The present is the fruit of the past and the germ of the future. No work can stand unless it grows out of the real wants of the age and strikes firm root in the soil of history. No one who tramples on the rights of a past generation can claim the regard of its posterity.

* "While of all studies in the whole range of knowledge the study of law affords the most conservative training, so the study of modern history is, next to theology itself, and only next in so far as theology rests on a divine revelation, the most thoroughly religious training that the mind can receive."—*Bishop Stubbs*.

History will disregard him who disregards her." That is, no man who sets at naught the lessons that history transmits to him can hope to transmit influence to the future.

Bolingbroke quotes Dionysius, "History is philosophy teaching by examples." Moreover, it is the only channel through which philosophy can directly instruct or influence a majority of mankind. The typical fact or story of the historian will make a lodgment in minds that the generalizations of the philosopher can never enter.

"Truth embodied in a tale
Shall enter in at lowly doors."

It is the old distinction between the concrete and the abstract, the particular and the general, example and precept.

The practical value of history is a commonplace. A few of the many testimonies to its use may be transcribed.

Milton. Children are to know the beginning, end, and reasons of political societies, and to dive into the grounds of law and legal justice.

Guizot. History is a great school of truth, reason, and virtue.

Locke. I recommend it to one who hath well settled in his mind the principles of morality, and knows how to make a judgment on the actions of men as one of the most useful studies he can apply himself to. There he shall see a picture of the world and the nature of mankind, and so learn to think of men as they are. There he shall see the rise of opinions, and find from what slight and sometimes shameful occasions some of them have taken their rise, which yet afterward have had great authority and passed almost for sacred in the world, and borne down all before them. There also one may learn great and useful instructions of prudence, and be warned against the cheats and rogueries of the world, with many more advantages which I shall not here enumerate.

Carlyle. Clio was prefigured by the ancients as the eldest daughter of Memory, and chief of the Muses; which dignity, whether we regard the essential qualities of her art, or its practice and acceptance among men, we shall still find to have been fitly bestowed. History, as it lies at the root of all science, is also the

first distinct product of man's spiritual nature, his earliest expression of what can be called thought. . . . Let us search more and more into the past; let all men explore it as the true fountain of knowledge, by whose light alone, consciously or unconsciously employed, can the present or the future be interpreted or guessed at.

Macaulay. Many truths, too, would be learned, which can be learned in no other manner. As the history of states is generally written, the greatest and most momentous revolutions seem to come upon them like supernatural inflictions, without warning or cause. But the fact is, that such revolutions are almost always the consequences of moral changes, which have gradually passed on the mass of the community, and which ordinarily proceed far, before their progress is indicated by any public measure. An intimate knowledge of the domestic history of nations is therefore absolutely necessary to the prognosis of political events. A narrative, defective in this respect, is as useless as a medical treatise which should pass by all the symptoms attendant on the early stage of a disease, and mention only what occurs when the patient is beyond the reach of remedies.

Morley. It is the present that really interests us; it is the present that we seek to understand and to explain. I do not in the least want to know what happened in the past, except as it enables me to see my way more clearly through what is happening to-day. I want to know what men thought and did in the thirteenth century, not out of any dilettante or idle antiquarian's curiosity, but because the thirteenth century is at the root of what men think and do in the nineteenth.

Mr. Morley goes too far. 'While history is at bottom a guidance study, it still does much more for the mind than simply to furnish it some practical lessons. Professor Seeley comes nearer the truth when he says, "History should not *merely* gratify the reader's curiosity about the past, but modify his views of the present."

II. While slight attention suffices to show that history has disciplinary value, some well-directed thought is required to discover how great and varied this value is.

1. Taught even in the poorest way—that is, by dint of iterating and reiterating unorganized facts—it trains the

memory ; taught philosophically—that is, care being taken wisely to choose and properly to organize the facts—it yields to no other subject in mnemonic value. It has been said that history is a fact study ; it will be shown hereafter that its facts are readily capable of complete organization by means of those great associating activities—time, place, and cause and effect.

2. All that has been urged concerning the memory will be admitted. But that history is an equally valuable discipline of the imagination has not been as generally perceived. History is man-picturing, as geography is earth-picturing. At this point teachers and writers have made great mistakes. Only too often have they assumed that to teach this subject nothing more is necessary than to lodge in the memory masses of dry and unrelated facts—dates, names, statistics, and the like ; whereas, it is rather revealing to the mind's eye the whole movement that constitutes the life of a man, a city, or a nation, or some selected portion of such movement. No mind can take in such a scene as Cæsar's death, the Field of the Cloth of Gold, or the appearance of Maria Theresa with her youthful son before the Hungarian nobles, without the active employment of his imaginative faculties ; and much less such complicated scenes and series of historical transactions as the Seven Years' War or the growth of the United States. For this purpose an active imagination is as necessary as in painting a battle-scene on canvas. What power is called for even to glance over the field surveyed by Gibbon in the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and how valuable is the resulting discipline ! To a pupil of a dull and wingless mind the river of time is but a name, as the Amazon is only a line of ink on a sheet of paper.

3. But history does far more for the mind than merely to exercise the powers of representation ; it is also a valuable discipline of the thinking faculties.

First, analysis is involved in the recognition of the facts with which we deal. Complex facts must be resolved into

simple ones. Many facts called simple are really complex, and must be analyzed before they can be understood. Arnold's treason is a fact, but one composed of many minor facts. Our Civil War is a fact, but one that sums up volumes of history. History makes an equally strong appeal to the faculty of comparison or judgment. Events and characters are a constant challenge to the balancing power of the mind. This is strikingly true of such writings as Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, and also in some degree of the simplest historical compositions. Then judgment passes into reasoning or thinking proper. Here the characteristic mental act is inference, or the drawing of conclusions from premises. If the study consists of the mere committing to memory of facts, it will do little for any of the logical powers; but studied philosophically, due attention being paid to the discovery of relations and the criticism of method, it becomes a noble exercise of thought. Nicely to observe chronological connections and geographical conditions, carefully to search out causes, is thinking no less than solving mathematical problems. This is why Bishop Stubbs contends that history is a good school of the judgment. Thus, while history is primarily a fact study and not a logical study, it is by no means destitute of valuable logical elements. The argument on this point can not, however, be fully stated, until we take account of the nature of historical subject-matter.

As remarked above, historical knowledge is moral knowledge. Mathematical studies deal with certain data and their method is demonstration. They start with definitions and axioms that are intuitively perceived, and proceed by necessary inference to inevitable conclusions. There is no gathering of facts, no balancing of opposite arguments, no halting or hesitation. There can be no looking at the other side, because there is no other side. Uncertainty is an impossible state of mind. Very different are the problems of practical life, springing out of the relations of human beings. Very different the transaction of human business. Here we accumulate data, weigh the force of opposing evidence, recon-

cile contradictory views, and at last reach probable conclusions. No merchant, manufacturer, or ship-owner can demonstrate that a given venture will be successful. Generals can not certainly predict the issue of battles and campaigns; if they could, battles would not be fought or campaigns be waged. Politicians are not absolutely sure that canvasses and elections will turn out so and so. And so it is with the teacher, the preacher, and the moralist.

In historical matters the process of making up one's mind is a kind of moral bookkeeping : some items are entered on the credit side and some on the debit side of the ledger, and then a balance is struck between them. Hence it is that, as one has said, "the most important gift, after all, of a citizen in such a profession as politics, or law, or medicine, or teaching, or war, is ability in the selection of the premises from which the solution of the various problems of life is to be extracted. In fact, soundness of judgment and clearness of perception in collecting and arranging these premises is a large part of each man's or woman's work in the world." The moral world is, indeed, governed by laws fixed and unalterable : what a man sows, that he also reaps, is the fundamental fact ; but a large majority of its situations and problems, and all its difficult ones, combine opposite and confusing elements.

Now, mathematical and scientific discipline enables the mind to deal with those subjects, both numerous and important, into which demonstration enters, but does not necessarily enable it to handle the elements of probability, or human questions. On the contrary, it may even unfit the mind for such work. As the writer just quoted remarks : "The mathematician's data are all provided for him with the utmost precision, and he is forbidden to add thereto or take away therefrom one jot or tittle. Consequently, it is possible to be a great mathematician indeed, and be at the same time a very ordinary person in most other fields of mental activity, and especially in what may be called, using the term in its largest sense, the transaction of human busi-

ness." It has also been said that an exclusive study of biological science "may incapacitate one for what is of all things most practical, namely, historical reasoning." Hence we must resort to some other source than mathematics or science for this kind of discipline. And when we remember that historical knowledge is moral knowledge; that its subject-matter is the doings of human beings; in a word, that it moves in the wide field of freedom and so of probability, we discover that we have in history the very discipline that we need.

As the author of several well-known historical text-books says, "The object of teaching history is not to cram with facts and dates (useful and indeed necessary as these are), but to awaken thought, and especially to teach the habit of thinking intelligently about the political events of our own and other countries." A second writer speaks of "that insight into character, that training of judgment and sympathy to which the detailed study of a historical special subject may help" the student. Still a third tells us that history embraces "to a great extent the principles on which the every-day life of the world around us is being conducted."

But there is even more involved in the matter than has yet appeared. To the mere perception of an object—that is, its recognition as present to the mind—apperception adds its inward digestion and assimilation; or, as one has said, "We identify the object, or those features of it which were familiar to us before; we recognize it; we explain it; we interpret the new by our previous knowledge, and thus are enabled to proceed from the known to the unknown, and make new acquisitions; in recognizing the object we classify it under various general classes; in identifying it with what we have seen before, we note also the differences which characterize the new object, and lead to the definition of new species or varieties."* It is impossible to exaggerate

* Dr. W. T. Harris. Preface to A Text-Book in Psychology, by Herbert, International Education Series.

the importance of our present knowledge as a means to further acquisition ; and yet many teachers seem not to appreciate, or not fully to appreciate, the relation between the two.

Now, a young person on admission to the world of man is immersed in a sea of facts wholly different in their nature from the facts of the material world. They are facts of the human mind, facts of the intellect, and, what are still more difficult, facts of the sensibility and the will ; and the most important question concerning his education is, How has this education prepared him for this new world? Reference is made, of course, to the time when the youth assumes a separate place in the social body, independently of parent or tutor. It may be said that this step is progressively taken, and not all at once ; also, that antecedent life is the best possible training for work in the new sphere, which is in fact but an extension of the old sphere ; but the fact still remains that the youth requires a careful discipline under the hand of a competent teacher in those studies which look immediately to social activities. And among these studies history must be inscribed.

It may be objected that historical questions are not practical questions ; that they come from books and documents, and not from the haunts of living men instinct with thought, passion, and will. There is truth in this view ; no proper school subject is just like real life, while history can be made almost as abstract as mathematics itself. The reply is, that no other school subject, save possibly certain forms of literature, comes so near to real life, and that the dry abstractness so often complained of is mainly the fault of the author and the teacher. If the teacher deals with human beings, and not merely with names, dates, and other items of fact, there will be no lack of interest. It should also be observed that the fact just maintained is to a degree a point of advantage. Both history and politics are great educative powers, but history has this advantage over politics, that it enlists less passion and prejudice, and so is a better school of the judg-

ment. On a similar ground Bishop Stubbs argues that ancient and mediæval history surpass modern and recent history as such a discipline. And yet he truly says, "The subject-matter of modern historical inquiry has peculiar advantages for the training of the powers most constantly in exercise in a practical generation."

III. On this division of the subject a few words will suffice. Mr. Matthew Arnold tells us that the great source of culture is the best things that have been thought and said. Why not add, "and done"? But whether we include deeds as well as words and thoughts in the formula or not, argument is not necessary to show that history enriches and adorns the mind with noble ideas. Its natural affiliations are not with mathematics or science, but with literature, which the great writer just named considered the true source of culture. There is a truth lurking in the Greek conception of the Muse of History.

The idea that there are studies which, on account of their peculiar influence on the mind, may appropriately be called humanity, or the humanities, originated in antiquity. Says Aulus Gellius: "*Humanitas*—that is, instruction in good arts, the which whosoever truly take to and seek after are in very deed most human. For the caring for this knowledge and its discipline out of all living things is given to human beings only; and therefore hath it been called *humanitas*." The humanities are the man-studies; they liberalize the mind, freeing it from prejudice, narrowness, selfishness. History is one of the group, and in some aspects the noblest of the group. "The real use of traveling to distant countries and of studying the annals of past times," says Macaulay, "is to preserve men from the contraction of mind which those can hardly escape whose whole communion is with one generation and one neighborhood, who arrive at conclusions by means of an induction not sufficiently copious, and who therefore constantly confound exceptions with rules and accidents with essential properties." And again: "The student, like the tourist, is transported into a new

state of society. He sees new fashions. He hears new models of expression. His mind is enlarged by contemplating the wide diversities of laws, of morals, and of manners."

IV. History furnishes motive power as well as guidance. It is oar or sail, and not merely chart and rudder. Men who are chosen as models, or who are imitated without conscious choice, furnish impulse as well as a pattern to those who imitate them. This is the great reason why moral example is so effective. To the common mind, there is far more energy in a man or a life than in an idea or a creed.

One of the best known forms of motive power is the patriotic sentiment or love of country. And it is mainly at the altar of history that patriotism feeds her fires. The patriotic orator or poet indeed invokes the inspiration of the mountains and rivers, the vales and hills, the firesides and battlefields, of the fatherland or the mother country; but this is only because these material monuments are the imperishable symbols of the deeds and thoughts of men that are associated with them. It was not the plain of Marathon that expanded the soul of Demosthenes, but the generous souls that perished there in the tremendous struggle that Greece waged against the barbaric power of Asia. It is not the Concord turf that fires the heart and brain of the patriot, nerves his will, strengthens his purpose, or renews his hope, but the memory that

"Here once the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard round the world."

As Mr. Lincoln said at Gettysburg, what the soldiers who fell in that great strife did, and not what he or others might say about it, makes that name immortal. The flag, be it the Union Jack, the tricolor, or the Stars and Stripes, is not the piece of parti-colored silk; it is the national emblem for which patriots have suffered and died. What charms the traveler visiting foreign countries is not always, or perhaps commonly, the scenery considered as plain or valley, sea or

mountain, but the human associations with which these are invested. As a great geographer* has said :

The admiration with which travelers behold Greece is due, above all, to the memories attaching to every one of its ruins, the smallest among its rivulets, and the most insignificant rock in its seas. Scenery in Provence or in Spain, though it may surpass in grace or boldness of outline anything to be seen in Greece, is appreciated only by a few. The mass go past it without emotion, for names like Marathon, Leuctra, or Plataea are not connected with it, and the rustle of bygone ages is not heard.

No people were ever more patriotic than the Jews; with them, love of country has often passed beyond enthusiasm into fanaticism. And what is the cause of this extraordinary fervor? Far more than anything else it is the stress laid on the national history as the means of forming the youthful character. Not only in the family and in the school, but in the synagogue, the study of the great poets, warriors, prophets, and rulers of Israel has been strongly emphasized.

Of late much attention has been paid to teaching patriotism in the schools of our country. The spectacular means so frequently resorted to serve a certain purpose, but in the long run the great means of teaching patriotism must be history and literature. Study of the times that tried men's souls tends to form souls that are capable of enduring trial.

Education should have respect to all the powers of the mind. It should aim at developing all the faculties of the perceptive, representative, and reflective groups. More than this, it should, as far as practicable, exercise them upon subjects appropriate to prepare them for dealing with all the great groups of activities. So much will be admitted. †

* Reclus: *The Earth and its Inhabitants*, vol. i, 38, 1882.

† Discussing the points to be aimed at in teaching history, Mr. J. Wells, of Wadham College, Oxford, sums up as follows:

"1. Of course, to educate our children.

"2. To give them some idea, so far as possible, of their duties as citizens; to make them, in Milton's words, 'steadfast pillars of the state.'

It is quite unnecessary to enlarge upon the general observation that, if history is made the noble educational agent which has been described, it must be properly studied and taught. But to a single point some remarks may be directed.

Since the elements of history are facts to be remembered, the student from first to last relies more upon his memory than the student of mathematics or the sciences. Again, history is the storehouse of human experience, the mirror of past ages. It is therefore the typical study as respects the conservative faculties of the mind and the conservative tendencies of society. At this point it is that a word of caution needs to be spoken. If the facts of history are taught simply or mainly to be remembered; if the teacher considers the pupil's mind only a receptacle to be filled; if the student's sole ambition is "to know" a great deal of history—then the powers of analysis, comparison, and inference will be but feebly developed. Nay, more; the mind will take on a conservative cast, facing backward rather than forward, and so be unfitted for useful initiative in practical affairs. Rightly studied, history has a strongly sobering effect upon the mind, in which fact consists much of its value; taught as a mnemonic exercise, it becomes a burden and an obstacle to progress. No country is, or perhaps can be, more thoroughly saturated with historicalism than China. "A Chinese memorial," it has been said, "is nothing if not historical; nor has any argument a chance of acceptance which is not based upon precedent." What China is, I need not pause to tell. The results are all the worse if history is regarded as a necessary evolution, in which the individual will counts for nothing, because history becomes then a bar to free individual and social movement.

"3. To make them love England, to use the phrase of Macaulay, 'as the Athenians loved the city of the violet crown.'

"4. To make them interested in those bits of Old England which are always round them in buildings, in institutions, in offices."—*The Teaching of History in Schools*, London, 1892, 16.

Germane to the subject also is the undoubted fact that an exclusive study of one's own country, especially when the student is narrow-minded to begin with, tends to conceit. Witness the enormous complacency of the Chinese. Happily, an efficient corrective is furnished by general history, and particularly by the careful study of other countries. Here comes in that mental enlargement, that acquaintance and sympathy with other lands and ages, which entitles history to rank as one of the humanities.

The question may be asked, Why preface a book on teaching history that is designed to be practical with a dissertation on its educational uses? The question is pertinent, especially as the answer will show that the practical and the theoretical can not be separated.

Dr. Arnold said, "It is clear that in whatever it is our duty to act, those matters also it is our duty to study." The teacher's function as an instructor is determined by the relations of knowledge to the mind, or it is rather to cause his pupil to use knowledge in such a way as to promote proper mental growth. As a former of minds, he has no duty to perform that is not included in this generalization. That the teacher may successfully prosecute his art, he must know—

1. The activities of the mind, their nature and relations, and their respective values as determined by the facts of life, individual and social ; or, in other words, he must have an educational ideal.

2. The varieties of knowledge—or, as Bacon called them, the "knowledges"—and their power to stimulate and form the mind, in respect both to quantity and quality ; or he must have worked out, partially at least, the problem of educational values.

The person who has this knowledge conjoined with skill in bringing knowledge, or the world, and the mind into vital relation, can successfully discharge the function of a teacher, and only such person can do so.

CHAPTER II.

THE FIELD OF HISTORY.

References.—Diesterweg, Spencer, Carlyle, and Macaulay: same references as in previous chapter; Green: A Short History of the English People (author's preface to the original edition, and Mrs. Green's preface to the revised edition); McMaster: A History of the People of the United States (Introduction).

IN the broadest sense, history is the story of man living in social relations in the world, as traced in various records and memorials. More narrowly, it is the story of man living in the higher social relations that constitute the civil state or civilization. Dr. Arnold calls history "the biography of a political society or commonwealth," meaning by these terms a state.

The writer who set the earliest copy of historical composition that has come down to us, thus states his purpose: "This is a publication of the researches of Herodotus of Halicarnassus, in order that the actions of men may not be effaced by time, nor the great and wondrous deeds displayed both by Greeks and Barbarians deprived of renown; and among the rest, for which cause they waged war upon each other." Here we have the characteristic feature of our subject. History deals with the actions of men, in contradistinction to natural history that deals with the facts of vegetable and animal life. In this all students are agreed.

History is divisible into two grand departments—general and special history. The first deals with man in his broadest relations. Practically the so-called general or universal histories are all more or less limited, being confined to the

main stream of human movement, to the exclusion of side currents and back waters ; but their name implies that they are histories of the world. - Special history, on the other hand, deals with man in his narrower or particular relations. Works falling under this division are occupied with special countries, states, cities, or periods, as Egypt and Greece, Athens and Prussia, Rome and Venice, the Crusades, the Thirty Years' War, and the eighteenth century. Ancient, mediæval, and modern history are but chronological divisions of general history. On this second point also there is a common agreement.

Either one of the divisions now described may be considered under two aspects. The student or writer may take a broad view of his subject, covering many different groups of facts ; or he may take a narrow view, confining his attention to some particular group of facts. Proceeding in the first way, he produces either a general history, or a work dealing with some division of it, as the history of Europe, France, or America. Proceeding in the second way, he produces an ecclesiastical history, a constitutional history, a military history, etc. Nor is there any difference of opinion touching this point.

As to the subject-matter of the special branches of history, there can be no dispute. The ecclesiastical historian is concerned with religion or the Church, the constitutional historian with political institutions, the industrial historian with the employments and occupations of men. But as to history in the broader sense—that is, universal history or some selected portion of it—there is a wide difference of opinion and practice. All historians agree that this consists of the actions of men, but all do not agree upon the question, What actions ? This question is so important as to demand brief consideration.

Living in an age when books were few, and in a country where libraries did not exist, Herodotus carried on his researches mainly by means of travel and personal inquiry, and there is almost as much reason for calling him the

father of travellers as the father of historians. He visited in person the principal countries and cities of which he wrote. Giving wide scope to the phrase "the actions of men," he included in his immortal book a varied selection of information—scientific theories, geographical descriptions, religious rites, national and tribal manners and customs, personal anecdotes, conversations, speeches, and dialogues, as well as facts relating to governments, dynasties, kings, wars, and conquests. This was a conception of history very natural at a time when the several branches of literature were but faintly differentiated, and it was obviously too broad to be maintained permanently. Still, it was a truer conception than one that has sometimes obtained currency in later times.

The subsequent development of historical composition need not be marked out. It suffices to say that in time the tendency to confine history closely to the transactions of government and the doings of important personages became strong. The court, the camp, and the halls of state now absorb the student's principal attention. A great writer of our own times (Dr. E. A. Freeman) keyed his historical writings to the motto, "History is past politics, politics present history." This is the governmental theory. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in criticising history as formerly taught in the schools of England, and as commonly written, says it consists of the biographies of monarchs, court intrigues, plots, usurpations, and the like; and he demands to be told what it is out of the accumulated details making up the narrative, that helps one in deciding on his conduct as a citizen. Lord Macaulay more tersely describes this view of history. "Most people," he says, "seem to imagine that a detail of public occurrences—the operations of sieges, the changes of administration, the treaties, the conspiracies, the rebellions—is a complete history. Historians have, almost without exception, confined themselves to the public transactions of states."

This narrowing of the field was due to a variety of causes. The term "government" sums up a great number of the important actions of men. Government exemplifies historical continuity better, perhaps, than any other single fact, thus furnishing the best clew through the tangled labyrinth of human affairs, and in its successions and divisions furnishes a good chronological scheme for the organization of historical material. The Greeks counted time by Olympiads, but the Egyptians referred events to reigns and dynasties, the Romans to consular terms, and modern peoples have often followed the Roman and Egyptian examples. Battles and wars are important in themselves, and are also among the most striking and exciting of historical events. Emperors, kings, generals, and other great people rather than the multitude, arrest the attention of the common observer ; and where monarchical ideas prevail, or hero worship abounds, it is not surprising that historians should assign to them an exaggerated importance. Finally, the ever-widening field of human actions practically compels a limitation of the historian's view.

The conception of history that is now most current in English-speaking countries assigns large room to the popular element. It originated in democratic ideas, and it gives the first place to the people or the nation. Writing to one of his correspondents about his *History* previous to its publication, Lord Macaulay said he should not be satisfied unless he produced something which should for a few days supersede the last fashionable novel on the tables of young ladies. And this he actually did. His biographer tells us that "at Dukinfield, near Manchester, a gentleman who thought that there would be a certain selfishness in keeping so great a pleasure to himself, invited his poorer neighbors to attend every evening after their work was finished, and read the *History* aloud to them from beginning to end. At the close of the last meeting one of the audience rose, and moved, in north-country fashion, a vote of thanks to Mr. Macaulay for having written a history which workingmen

can understand.”* It is easy to point out serious defects in *The History of England from the Accession of James II.*, but no one can deny that it is both eminently instructive and eminently readable. It is equally easy to tell how its author produces his magical effects.

First, he is a master story-teller. For the art of narration he was admirably fitted both by nature and by training. But, secondly—and this is more to the present purpose—Macaulay selects his facts with the utmost care according to a certain theory. He tells us that the two rulers of this province of literature are reason and imagination; that it is a combination of the novel and the essay, a compound of poetry and philosophy; and gives us to understand that the perfect historian, at least of England, would be a compound of Mr. Hallam and Sir Walter Scott. He exclaims against that false dignity or majesty of history—those absurd conventional decencies—that rob the historian of many of his most valuable materials. He thinks that the historian’s business is to depict the national life. He sees the place that government holds in the world, but also the place that the people hold. The perfect historian “shows us the court, the camp, and the senate. But he shows us also the nation. He considers no anecdote, no peculiarity of manner, no familiar saying, as too insignificant for his notice, which is not too insignificant to illustrate the operation of laws, of religion, and of education, and to mark the progress of the human mind. Men will not merely be described, but will be made intimately known to us. The changes of manners will be indicated, not merely by a few general phrases, or a few extracts from statistical documents, but by appropriate images presented in every line.”

A later English writer—one of whom it was said that he had rediscovered the lost art of historical composition; one whose best known work reached in a few years its one hundredth edition—carried Macaulay’s central thought still fur-

* Trevelyan: *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, N. Y., ii, 207.

ther. Defining the aim of his *Short History of the English People*, Mr. J. R. Green wrote in his preface :

The aim of the following work is defined by its title: it is a history, not of English kings or English conquests, but of the English People. At the risk of sacrificing much that was interesting and attractive in itself, and which the constant usage of our historians has made familiar to English readers, I have preferred to pass lightly and briefly over the details of foreign wars and diplomacies, the personal adventures of kings and nobles, the pomp of courts, or the intrigues of favorites, and to dwell at length on the incidents of that constitutional, intellectual, and social advance in which we read the history of the nation itself. It is with this purpose that I have devoted more space to Chaucer than to Cressy, to Caxton than to the petty strife of Yorkist and Lancastrian, to the Poor Law of Elizabeth than to her victory at Cadiz, to the Methodist revival than to the escape of the Young Pretender.

It has been said of Mr. Green :

However Gibbon might err in massing together his social facts in chapters apart, however inadequate Hume's attempts at social history might be, however Macaulay might look at social facts merely as bits of external ornament, they all, he maintained, professed the faith he held. He used to protest that even those English historians who desired to be merely "external and pragmatic," could not altogether reach their aim as though they had been "High Dutchmen." The free course of national life in England was too strong to allow them to become ever wholly lost in state papers.*

Mr. J. B. McMaster is writing his popular work, *A History of the People of the United States*, on similar lines. His opening paragraph defines his plan.

The subject of my narrative is the history of the people of the United States of America from the close of the war for independence down to the opening of the war between the States. In the course of this narrative much, indeed, must be written of wars, conspiracies, and rebellions; of Presidents, of Congresses, of embassies,

* Mrs. Green's Preface to the Revised Edition.

of treaties, of the ambition of political leaders in the senate house, and of the rise of great parties in the nation. Yet the history of the people shall be the chief theme. At every stage of the splendid progress which separates the America of Washington and Adams from the America in which we live, it shall be my purpose to describe the dress, the occupations, the amusements, the literary canons of the times; to note the changes of manners and morals; to trace the growth of that humane spirit which abolished punishment for debt, which reformed the discipline of prisons and of jails, and which has, in our own time, destroyed slavery and lessened the miseries of dumb brutes.

Carlyle clearly discerned the imperfection of the governmental theory, and saw that the time had come for a change on the part of the historian.

From of old it was too often to be reproachfully observed of him that he dwelt with disproportionate fondness in senate houses, in battlefields, nay, even in kings' antechambers; forgetting that far away from such scenes the mighty tide of thought and action was still rolling on its wondrous course, in gloom and brightness; and in its thousand remote valleys, a whole world of existence with or without an earthly sun of happiness to warm it, with or without a heavenly sun of holiness to purify and sanctify it, was blossoming and fading, whether the 'famous victory' were won or lost. The time seems coming when much of this must be amended; and he who sees no world but that of courts and camps, and writes only how soldiers were drilled and shot, and how this ministerial conjurer outconjured that other, and then guided or at least held something which he called the rudder of government, but which was rather the spigot of taxation, wherewith, in place of steering, he could tap, the more cunningly the nearer the lees—will pass for a more or less instructive gazetteer, but will no longer be called a historian.

No doubt the democratic theory of history may be overdone; but those who are in touch with the modern spirit are little likely to question that it is a much truer theory than the one that limits the field to a mere detail of public transactions. Still, it must be said that the history of

different countries is by no means composed of the same elements. In some the master factors are the king and the government, in others the people themselves. Sometimes the sphere of the state is so enlarged that nearly all the most important actions of men are public occurrences ; again, the people are most prominent in initiating and carrying on many of the most important interests of society. Of course, such differences must appear in history. Contrast the civilizations of Egypt and Assyria with those of Greece and Rome. In the Eastern nations everything is uniform and monotonous ; men move before us on the historic page a dumb and lifeless herd, without individual or personal character. Despots of unlimited power rule over men in brute masses, but there is in our sense no national life and no people. There are conquerors and lawgivers, but no statesmen or politics as we understand statesmanship and politics. In Europe all this is very different. The moment we cross the Bosphorus or the Mediterranean the scene changes : there are a people, a public life, statesmen, politicians, and orators ; government is carried on by modern methods—that is, by argument and persuasion ; we see somebody besides the king. In Athens, Socrates teaches in the market place ; Æschylus and Sophocles write for the theatres that are thronged with people ; Pericles comes in the room of Pharaoh. Modern history really began in Greece. Or consider the civilization of France and England. In France the government, in addition to conducting the civil and military administration, patronizes art, science, and literature, and provides public works on a vast scale, while in England these latter interests have been largely left, though by no means wholly so, to the energy of voluntary individual and co-operative enterprise. A French writer could not find as large a theme in a History of the French People as Mr. Green found in England or as Mr. McMaster finds in America. The conclusion is, that histories of different countries, if well written, will combine the governmental and the popular element in quite different proportions. For example, the

French colonies of America from the first were children of power and patronage, and so grew up dependent and almost helpless ; the English colonies, on the other hand, planted by voluntary efforts and left very largely to themselves, grew up vigorous and independent. The place that is occupied by the government in the one instance is occupied by the people in the other.

Still another difficulty should be noted. It is not practicable to make the history that is taught in common schools very broad or discursive. There must be a pretty strict limitation of matter. This point will be more fully considered when we come to deal with the choice of facts ; but it is pertinent to observe here that, after the preliminary stage is passed, the story of the government, or the record of public transactions, must constitute the backbone of what is taught, at least until the differentiated work of the college is reached. Still, the social aspects of history should by no means be overlooked in the common school.

CHAPTER III.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

References.—Adams: A Manual of Historical Literature (the bibliographies); H. B. Adams and others: Johns Hopkins University Studies, Eighth Series, XI., XII. (Seminary Notes on Recent Historical Literature); White: Papers of the Historical Association, I., No. II. (On Studies in General History and the History of Civilization); Hart: The Academy, II. (A List of General Readings in the History of the United States); Hall: Methods of Teaching History (the bibliographies); Gordy and Twitchell: A Pathfinder of American History (numerous lists of well-selected books); Davidson: Reference History of the United States; Barnes: Studies in General History, Studies in Greek and Roman History, Studies in American History, also Teachers' Manuals and Aids; Heilprin: Historical Reference-Book.

It is a matter of regret that the teachers who are teaching history in the schools of the country command such slender resources. Those who are thus employed in the district schools and in the elementary grades of the towns and cities, it is to be feared, have commonly derived their knowledge wholly or mainly from the text-books that they use, and perhaps one or two similar books besides. Nor is the equipment of high-school teachers by any means all that we could desire. No doubt there are many capable teachers in both kinds of schools. The general subject of the teacher's qualifications will be dealt with in another place; but it is desirable to describe here the principal sources of knowledge with which the ideal teacher must be more or less familiar, and also to offer such practical remarks as can be made with most effect.

I. To begin at the teacher's desk, text-books of history may first be mentioned. Such books are commonly only compilations from larger works, but they demand special attention because they are prepared with special reference to the needs of the school and of the pupils. That the teacher should thoroughly know the book in daily use does not need to be argued, but it does need to be emphasized. More than this, the teacher should also know quite familiarly a few other text-books dealing with the same subject, two or three at least. The advantages of such familiarity are, that a wider view of the subject may be obtained, and that different ways of putting things may be studied ; or, if the topical method is pursued, the teacher assigning topics and sending the pupils to the library, the teacher should be acquainted with the authorities that the pupils resort to for information.

No text-books now used in schools, when compared with those in use a generation ago, show greater improvement than books in history. Such books as Gardiner's, Myers's, Montgomery's, and Johnston's were not then in existence. It may also be said, for the further encouragement of teachers, that still greater improvement may be expected.

II. The next class of books to be mentioned consists of the larger historical works that cover the same ground as the text-books. Text-books are nothing but outlines, and can be nothing else—skeletons, with a little flesh and blood and life ; and the teacher will never understand the bearings of a subject so that he can fully explain it, and much less possess a sufficient fund for illustration and expansion, if he is wholly dependent upon them. To consult several such books will not suffice, although that is a great advantage. They are always more or less dry and confined, while the teacher should know something of the freedom which the author shows who is not limited to a fixed number of pages. For a teacher of American history who holds a practically permanent position, and so has opportunity for

self-improvement, to be ignorant of Bancroft, Hildreth, McMaster, and Schöuler should be counted a disgrace. More than this, he should have read, volume by volume, Fiske's *Discovery of America*, *The American Revolution*, and *The Critical Period of American History*, and Parkman's admirable series, *France and England in North America*. He should be cognizant of some of the more valuable works devoted to particular sections of the country, as Palfrey's *History of New England*, and to particular periods, as Adams's *History of the United States*.

Of the numerous histories of the Civil War no one stands out with marked prominence. For the political side, perhaps Greeley's *American Conflict* is as good as any; while for the military side, the series of volumes called *The Campaigns of the Civil War* may be recommended.

Here it may be observed that no teacher should attempt to deal comprehensively with the Civil War, or indeed with any series of military operations that are to be treated somewhat in detail, without first forming a conspectus of the whole. This requires much patient study and much exercise of the imagination. As an aid, Colonel T. A. Dodge's *Bird's-Eye View of Our Civil War* can be highly recommended. If the title does not sufficiently explain the character of this admirable work, these sentences may be quoted from the introduction: "The principal military events are herein grouped in such sequence that a careful reading, with maps before you, will yield you a fair knowledge of what modern war is, and what our Civil War was. . . . My aim has been to give the layman a clear idea of the war as a military whole, paying no heed to individual heroism, nor dwelling upon the war as a spectacle." While a book of this description is not properly a history of the war, it can not fail to be of great service to a student or teacher who, having looked at the war as a spectacle, filled his mind with facts, and observed sufficient instances of individual heroism, is thereby fitted to form a conspectus. Manifestly, such a book is not a proper one to put into the hands of a student first taking

up the subject, unless, indeed, he is a person having much knowledge of history and mental discipline.

III. History teaching in elementary schools, and to a considerable extent in high schools, should bear heavily on biography. Facts about a man arouse more interest and enthusiasm in pupils, and particularly in young pupils, than facts about a community or state; while for many purposes historical characters are the very best centers about which to group facts. A good life of Washington is almost a complete history of the Revolution; a good life of Lincoln, of the Civil War. Besides, such a life, and especially one of Lincoln, since he was the more original character, contains elements of interest that an ordinary history does not contain. But the value of history in men has, perhaps, been sufficiently emphasized on previous pages. Still, it is important to observe that the teacher's biographical reading should not be confined to men in public life, statesmen, and soldiers; business men, scholars, moral and religious reformers, men of letters, men of science, discoverers, and inventors, not only stand for invaluable elements of the national life, but they also furnish as instructive and healthful reading as boys and girls can have. Many men who have exercised far-reaching influence were never in public life at all—Fulton, Whitney, Morse, Garrison, Emerson, Agassiz, Ericsson, and many more. Mention may be made of diaries, autobiographies, and memoirs, which have an interest and charm in themselves. Perhaps no books relating to the Civil War are more valuable than the personal memoirs of Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan.

Many series* of English and American books may be

* We are living in an age of series. History, art, science, literature, and religion are set before the public in an endless array of monograph-groups. Whatever the disadvantages of the fashion, it has a distinct æsthetic significance. The dainty series is to the ponderous fourteen-volume history as a French cook's masterpiece to a Virginia barbecue. There may be more nourishment in the latter, but an appreciation of the former denotes the more refined palate.—*The Political Science Quarterly*, vol. v, p. 54.

mentioned that illustrate these observations. English Men of Action, English Men of Letters, Twelve English Statesmen, Rulers of India, The Queen's Prime Ministers. American Statesmen, American Men of Letters, American Religious Leaders, Great American Commanders, etc. The Questions of the Day Series also contain some good studies that will be useful to the teacher of history.

Both the volumes making up these series and the series themselves are of quite unequal merit. Many of them have a very high literary value. As contributions to American history, nearly all the Statesmen volumes may be strongly recommended. This is not because that, either singly or collectively, they have added materially to historical knowledge, but because they bring together important facts and group them around leading actors, thus adding to history the peculiar interest of biography. As most of the series mentioned are incomplete, the number of volumes is not given. Names of publishers and prices are readily obtainable.

IV. Books of a different class should have due mention. Historical scholarship tends strongly, as does scholarship in other branches of learning, to the production of works summing up the salient features of the subject in single volumes of convenient size, many of which are adapted both to scholars and to general readers. Green's Short History of the English People, save that it is rather large, is an excellent example of this kind of book. Bryce's Holy Roman Empire, while in no sense a popular book like Green's History, may also be mentioned. Seeley's Expansion of England handles an important subject in an engaging way. Lodge's Short History of the English Colonies belongs to the same class of works. Higginson's and Johnston's single volumes are the best ones treating of the United States. It may be observed that a good two-volume history of our country is a desideratum.

V. Of a somewhat different character are the various series of volumes, known both by general and special titles, that

deal with the striking epochs or phases of connected historical subjects. Such books often present in a clear manner the subjects with which they deal; they may be read to advantage as single works, or in connection with the other volumes of the series as sections or chapters of a continuous work. Many such series have been produced, or are in course of production, in England. Mention may be made of the following: Epochs of English History, Epochs of Modern History, Epochs of Ancient History, Epochs of Church History. The Epochs of American History and The American History Series are well-known examples of similar American books.

VI. A knowledge of constitutional and municipal law, religion, science, art, literature, moral reform, and many other subjects are necessary to the full illumination of history. It is very true that when general history is properly written, it includes much of this knowledge. But special works have the advantage of bringing attention to a special class of facts, and of permitting a more scientific treatment than is attainable in works of a general character. Such books as Cairnes's *The Slave Power*, Cooley's *Principles of Constitutional Law*, Curtis's *History of the Constitution*, De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, Bryce's *American Commonwealth*, Taussig's *Tariff History of the United States*, Sumner's *Financial History of the United States*, and Johnston's *American Politics*, may be given as examples. Valuable articles on such subjects are often found in the magazines and quarterlies. Mention may also be made of the cyclopædias, and particularly of Lalor's *Cyclopædia of Political Science, Political Economy, and United States History*.

VII. Treatises, dissertations, monographs, and essays devoted to special aspects or elements of history. Not only is history a very important factor in various studies that are not grouped under the head of historical, as political philosophy, constitutional law, and social science, but these sciences throw important light upon history. In his *Economical*

Interpretation of History, Professor Rogers illustrates this at much length, showing, for instance, how commerce, manufactures, and agricultural productions have exercised a profound influence upon the history of domestic politics, diplomacy, and war. Mr. W. B. Weeden has written his *Economical and Social History of New England, 1620-1789*, for a similar purpose. He tells us that "Economy, the daily order of living and fellowship, are homely elements which are coming to be recognized as potent factors in the large drama of history."

VIII. Books devoted to minor political communities should not be omitted. Many State histories are worthless, or nearly so; others are excellent; and while local histories as a class contain a vast amount of rubbish, there are few of them that have not some good material. State and local histories commonly abound in anecdote, story, and incident; to which it may be added that local history has its own peculiar educational value. Of State histories, The Commonwealth Series deserves particular mention. These volumes do not propose to give in detail the formal annals of each member of the Union, but "to sketch rapidly and forcibly the lives of those States which have had marked influence upon the structure of the nation, or have embodied in their formation and growth principles of American polity." While the different States of the Union have much in common, many of them present striking differences, and so illustrate different lessons.

Something more may fairly be said about local history. "The old-fashioned town histories are mines of crude historic ore," says Mr. Weeden, "while the actual records of the early time now being reproduced are invaluable." But, more than this, the student of local history has an advantage similar to that enjoyed by the botanist or biologist who puts a small section of the organism that he wishes to study under his microscope. There is a great advantage attending looking at history *in petto*. Some years ago I read with deep interest the section of an ill-put-together town history, en-

titled *The American Revolution*. The town was Torrington, Conn. Here were quotations from the town records, muster rolls of the militia companies, orders for drafts, requisitions for supplies, reports from the seat of war, lists of killed and wounded, etc., interspersed with some incident, anecdote, or personal characterization. Following the tax-gatherer on his rounds; reading the frequent calls for soldiers and orders for the militia to turn out; observing the women at their heavy tasks, spinning wool and weaving flax, making blankets and tents for the army, and often gathering the crops or making the maple sugar; scanning the hard bill of domestic fare, breakfast without tea and dinner without salt—I formed a more realistic view than before of the times that tried men's souls. And this suggests the reflection that division, brigade, and regimental histories supply interesting elements in the history of warfare that are not found in general history at all, or not in much abundance.

IX. From even a summary view of historical apparatus graphical representations can not be omitted. Such appliances are even more necessary in studying history than in studying the existing state of things in the world. How could historical geography be taught without historical maps? As Dr. Freeman says: "When a certain name as applied to a country conveys the idea of a certain state of things in that country, to apply that name to it at a time when that state of things did not exist, at once conveys a false impression; it suggests that the state of things which the name implies existed at a time when it did not exist." To carry back into historic times the present meaning of geographical names is what the same writer calls "bondage to the modern map."

In nothing does the historical student of to-day enjoy a greater advantage over the student of former days, and even of a few years ago, than in respect to historical geography, and particularly in respect to historical maps. Bondage to the modern map is now a voluntary and not a compulsory

servitude. Almost every new book dealing with an historical subject in a broad way contains one or more maps; while many books, and especially those dealing with military operations, have a "pocket" of maps. Good wall maps for the library and the classroom are comparatively inexpensive. Historical atlases are produced in such numbers, and are of such excellence and cheapness, that the student is actually embarrassed to choose among them. School histories of the United States well reflect the progress that has been made in this branch of scholarship: a book without a number of good maps is condemned by all competent judges.

X. All this time we have been dealing with history at second hand; we have been occupied with books in which the facts are not only selected by the author, but worked up by him ready for use. This is not sufficient: we must go back of the historian's printed page to inspect the materials that he has used in his preparation. Such materials may be divided into four classes.

1. Literary documents, such as laws, decisions of the courts, official proclamations, orders, reports and messages, charters, private letters, diaries, legislative records, and the like. General literature, both book and periodical, should also be mentioned, for it not only contains a multitude of facts, but also reflects, as official documents could not do, the manners, temper, and spirit of the times.

2. Monuments, inscriptions, ruins, and in fact everything coming under the head of archæology and antiquities. Even the tyro knows that investigations of these subjects have in recent years added greatly to our knowledge of the countries of the Old World, as Assyria and Egypt, and that they have created nearly all the knowledge that we have of the history and condition of our own continent previous to the coming of the white man.

3. Historical geography, study of the origin, meaning, distribution, and changes of geographical names. This im-

portant field of knowledge will be treated more fully in another place.

4. Natural science, more especially ethnology, physical geography, and geology. These studies join hand with archæology and antiquities. For instance, the question of the length of time that particular races have occupied different countries; the question of the order in which different races occupying the same country have appeared, as well as the question of the antiquity of man, must be determined, for the most part, by investigating the human relics that we find in recent geological deposits.*

The phrase "original materials" may be understood in two ways. In strictest sense, the original student discovers his own materials. He goes to veritable records and monuments, and searches for human memorials in caves and in the dust of the earth. But in a secondary sense he is an original student who makes good use of the materials that others have discovered and have either published or described.

The whole mass of printed documentary matter relating to the history of the United States is enormous. Since 1789 everything of consequence pertaining to the National Government has been published, either at the time of the transaction or soon afterward; the States also publish their current public history; while Congress, the States, learned

* "In most of the countries of Western Europe," says Hugh Miller, "Scotland among the rest, geological history may be regarded as ending where human history begins. The most ancient portions of the one piece on to the most modern portions of the other. But their line of junction is, if I may so express myself, not an abrupt, but a shaded line; so that, on the one hand, the human period passes so entirely into the geological that we found our conclusions respecting the first human inhabitants rather on what they deemed *geologic* than on the ordinary *historic* data; and, on the other hand, some of the latter and lesser geologic changes have taken place in periods comparatively so recent, that in even our own country we are able to catch a glimpse of them in the first dawn of history proper—that written history in which man records the deeds of his fellows."—*Popular Geology, Lecture I.*

societies, and enterprising publishers have given us pretty much everything that throws light upon our earlier history. In fact, only historical specialists have, or can have, much idea of the vast treasures of such lore that have accumulated in the great libraries of the country.

Another class of original materials will be found more generally interesting than official documents—the writings of prominent actors in history and of competent observers. It is not, indeed, supposed that the teachers of history in our public schools will read through the numerous and bulky volumes containing the writings of Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Adams, Jefferson, and others of our distinguished statesmen. All that is contended for is a sufficient acquaintance with such authorities to show what they are, to reveal their spirit, and to give some idea of the nature of historical materials.

While our country is inferior to many others in historical monuments, it is not wholly barren of them. The archæologist finds interesting subjects of study. A majority of teachers in the Mississippi Valley can form an acquaintance with the works of the Mound-Builders; at least, they can read some of the books in which these works are described, as Short's *North Americans of Antiquity*, and Foster's *Prehistoric Races in the United States of America*. Again, the geographical names of the country—Indian, Spanish, French, English—are found in every school atlas, and no great scholarship is required to read many of their lessons. From the fourth subdivision of the field the common student is shut out, save as he reads books written to elucidate it. Professor Wright's *The Ice Age in North America and its Bearings upon the Antiquity of Man* covers this ground; and so, in a less thorough way, does his *Man and the Glacial Period*.

Probably I should state distinctly that it has not been my aim to make out a list of books that will fully equip the teacher, but rather to survey the broad field of historical knowledge, and incidentally to give titles of books that well

illustrate the character of the work described. Naturally the question arises, How much of this field can the teacher be expected to cultivate?

In respect to the rank and file, it must be frankly admitted that we can not hope to see them become very accomplished historical scholars. The present state of the schools and the conditions surrounding them are such as to forbid large expectations. At the same time a good deal can be done, and should be done, even here to raise the standard of attainment.

Secondly, I have all the time been careful, in preparing this outline, to keep well within the limits that an enterprising teacher of good ability and good habits of study, who is also favorably situated, may fairly hope to reach. Such teacher, although he may be discouraged at the outset, will in the end be surprised to find how quickly he has skirted the field, and will then be more anxious than ever to enlarge his plan.

No doubt the principal criticism of my scheme will be that it includes original study. The bare mention that the high-school teacher, and still more the teacher in the elementary schools, should be not merely a reader of books of history but also an investigator of the material out of which such books are made, will strike many minds, and perhaps most minds, as a piece of extravagance. Hence it is necessary to show that some work of the kind is perfectly feasible. But first we should remark upon its peculiar value.

The student of science is not permitted to content himself with facts of physics, chemistry, botany, or geology that are obtained from books. He is sent to the laboratory, to the field or forest, to the rocks, for the observation of real facts, and, as far as possible, for experiment. The student of psychology and ethics is referred to his own consciousness, and the student of civil government to the legislature and the town meeting. Why should not similar work be required of students who are preparing to teach the important subject of history? As matters now stand, there is no

other study in the schools that rests so thoroughly upon a basis of authority. To an extent, no doubt, this inheres in the nature of the subject, but it is a criticism that can be in some part overcome.

The only work in history that is analogous to the original work in science—that is, in schools—is found in the historical seminaries of the colleges and universities. The method is the so-called “laboratory method.” Some historical works, and in fact many that deal with controverted subjects, do indeed contain more or less argument and criticism, with the citation of authorities, and so are a sort of historical seminary in themselves. Of such works Winsor’s *Narrative and Critical History of America* is a conspicuous example. It is to be feared, however, that the common reader too often skips these portions of the book. Critical discussions have no place in the early stages of instruction, but afterward they are invaluable. As to the historical seminary proper, its advantages are quite certain to continue limited to a few students. Seminary work makes a large demand upon the teacher as well as upon the pupil. It is not a method adapted to the wants of college freshmen; such original materials as are given to students of this grade of ability should be made subsidiary to a text-book or to the lectures of the instructor.

But while the common teacher of history in the schools of the country is shut out from the seminary room, he is not shut out from original information. There is not one of the four divisions of the field that he may not cultivate with good results. The fact is, he is now doing some work of the kind. For example, he studies the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Washington’s Farewell Address, and Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamations. Why should he not largely widen this field? All the materials that he needs are accessible. One of the promising signs of the times is the efforts that are made to bring historical documents to the student and the teacher. Such books as Poore’s *Charters and Constitu-*

tions, Preston's Documents Illustrative of American History, Neill's Virginia Company of London and Virginia Carolorum, and Brown's Genesis of the United States—an extensive compilation of documents relating to the Jamestown settlement—illustrate this tendency. Durand's Documents on the American Revolution is another good book. More expensive, and beyond the common student, is Stevens's Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives relating to America. There are also valuable series of documents adapted to use in the schoolroom that are within reach of the poorest. The first of these series, entitled The Old South Leaflets, edited by Mr. E. D. Mead, has already reached more than thirty numbers. A later series, American History Leaflets, Colonial and Constitutional, edited by Professors Hart and Channing, may also be commended. Mr. P. L. Ford's Writings of Christopher Columbus, which appeared last year, was also a timely publication.

Mr. Henderson, after declaring, in the preface to his Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages, that the bitterness of the struggles between the Papacy and the Empire can never be comprehended by one who has not seen the letters of Gregory VII, of Frederick Barbarossa, and of Boniface VIII, writes this paragraph:

And if, through reading original documents, one gains a clearer insight into the truth itself, how much more critical, and how much more appreciative, does one become toward modern writers. Let one of my readers compare a chapter of Milman's Latin Christianity with documents here given in the book on Church and State. Nothing can be more instructive than such an exercise. One can examine at leisure the materials with which the historian worked—his methods will be clear from knowing with what he had to deal; the documents themselves will be illumined by his intelligence and learning. A guide-book is only of real worth to those who are to some extent familiar with the scenes described.

The teacher who has never made an excursion into the field of original research can but poorly appreciate the

sense of reality and the interest that such studies impart to historical knowledge. No real student would be content to take Bancroft's account of the Declaration of Independence, or of the Constitution of the United States. Why should he be content with Prescott's, Fiske's, or Irving's account of Columbus's letter to Santangel, so long as that letter is within his reach? Washington's Journal of his visit to the Ohio in 1754 is better than the brilliant pages in which Mr. Parkman describes that visit; and John and Abigail Adams's Familiar Letters give a much better view of certain phases of the Revolutionary struggle than can be obtained from the pages of any historian.

No doubt it would be impossible for most teachers of history to carry original studies very far. They should remember, however, that such studies in history, even more than such studies in some other subjects, cast a light beyond their immediate borders. Nor is it to be expected that such teachers will make valuable additions to knowledge; the expectation is rather that, doing what they can in this field, they will make their work more real, fresh, and permanent.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHOICE OF FACTS.

References.—See references of Chapter II. Also Hall: *Methods of Teaching History* (particularly Introduction, and *Methods of Teaching History* by Dr. Adams); Freeman: *Methods of Historical Study*; Klemm, Spencer, Bain, Compayré, Fitch, and Currie: references previously given; Ransome: *Elementary History of England*; *The Journal of Education* (London), February, 1891 (pp. 86, 87).

IN teaching history the selection of materials is of unusual importance and difficulty. Few studies present such a disparity between what can be taught and what might be taught. While the store of facts is practically infinite, one of the ordinary Outlines or Manuals of General History, and two or three similar books relating to particular countries, supplemented by a little general reading, is a fair measure of what is accomplished under the traditionary method. With a better method, the amount of information imparted could be considerably increased, but still the disparity would not be very sensibly diminished. What to omit and what to include, when there is such an embarrassment of riches, is the crucial question that tests the competency of author and teacher alike.

The author is the first one to grapple with the question. Summoning to his aid his knowledge of the subject, of the pupil's ability, of the teacher's fitness, and the amount of time that will probably be given to the study in the school or schools, he essays his difficult task. Where the author's perplexity ceases the teacher's begins. No good teacher

attaches equal importance to all the facts that the author puts in his book, no matter how good the book may be; moreover, every good teacher goes beyond the book for facts that it does not contain. He is therefore compelled to do over again—on a smaller scale, perhaps—what the author has done before him. This, at least, is the course of things when instruction is given from a book. But it will simplify matters to drop the author out of sight, and to speak of the teacher as covering the whole ground. Their work is not, indeed, just the same, but it is sufficiently so to warrant us, at least for the time, in treating them as one person. By what criteria shall the teacher of history be guided in his choice of material?

Before attempting to answer, it should be observed that the only way to help the teacher at this point is to discuss the general subject with him. No sensible teacher of history asks how many facts he is to teach. No two teachers—if good ones—would teach the same number of facts, or just the same facts, to the same pupil or class, and much less to different classes. No sensible teacher asks what kind of facts he shall teach, expecting to receive in answer a tabulation of his material. He knows that general rules, accompanied by suitable illustrations, are the only useful answers to these questions.

I. It is obvious that the first thing to be considered is the stage of instruction immediately in hand. Facts are the materials dealt with from first to last, but not the same kinds of facts. The facts chosen, whatever the stage of progress may be, must be selected with prime reference to the pupil's ability to take in and assimilate them.

The facts presented in the primary stage must be particular, simple, and concrete. The child of elementary school age is not troubled to understand the facts that occur in the sphere of the home, the school, and the neighborhood; nor will he be troubled to understand similar facts in history, even if they be of a somewhat elevated character, provided they are presented to him in an interesting way. The first

lessons should be like the events that the child sees, hears, and reads of in the living world. Thus, he will readily pass from the known world of current life to the unknown world of historic life. Then, in addition to being simple and particular, the facts should be such as in real life would attract the attention and hold the imagination of the learner. It is not necessary here to repeat the familiar commonplaces about the early development of the perceptive and representative faculties of the mind. It is enough to say that children of quick fancy discover a great deal in the world that is picturesque and romantic; that they do a vast amount of poetizing and dramatizing, and that the teacher of primary history who does not keep this fact in mind, and take advantage of it, will seriously miss his way. The pictorial and poetical elements of history should never cease to receive recognition, since they belong to the subject-matter, but in the elementary school they should be thrown into the foreground. Again, the close relations existing between the feelings and the intellectual powers should not be lost sight of. Deep feeling does indeed interfere with vigorous intellectual activity, particularly in the young; at the same time a lively feeling, as of sympathy or admiration, greatly stimulates interest and mental action. The things that take hold of these feelings not only develop the moral nature of the child but they also cling to the memory. The fact that a child of a certain age is a hero-worshiper is full of meaning on the mere didactic side as well as on the moral side.

Personality is an element of great interest to adults and children alike. They are always pleased to hear about men. Of this we have a familiar proof in the depraved taste for mere gossip that is so common. Still further, the acts of men are more interesting to the common mind than their opinions and creeds. Hence it is that elementary instruction in history must hold closely to objective transactions. The Pilgrim Fathers themselves—their heroic deeds in defying sea and storm, hunger and cold, and a wily foe; their peaked hats, dark cloaks, and heavy swords—will impress

minds that do not respond to their civil and religious ideas or to the Pilgrim Compact. Then, the mind more readily seizes hold of individuals than of groups of individuals. Miles Standish cuts a deeper trace in the memory than the whole company that landed at Plymouth. Franklin will awaken interest when the Albany Congress fails to do so. Washington on his campaigns will hold the youthful attention more closely than the Continental Congress or the Federal Convention discussing and adopting resolutions. These are not the only kinds of facts that history deals with ; the teacher must also teach ideas and documents—show what it is all about. But the more abstract facts must follow those that are of a concrete and objective nature. So important are persons in history, that they should be made centers for grouping facts, as will be explained hereafter.

In well-ordered education, so far from there being a chasm between the elementary school and the secondary school, the first leads up to the second by progressive approaches. Still, the two schools stand for stages of progress in the pupil's ability and in the teacher's methods. The faculties of perception, of memory, and imagination are not relatively so prominent in the second stage, while those of analysis, comparison, and reasoning are more prominent. Secondary instruction in history, therefore, marks an advance, though not an abrupt advance, upon elementary instruction. This is a capital fact, not only in view of the organization of material, but also in view of its selection. Facts of a more general and abstract nature can now be taught. Personal agents should be less prominent. The conceptions of society and of the nation should be brought forward. Large political transactions—the acts of legislatures, congresses, and conventions—can be grasped, though not as fully as at a later time. Some of the easier questions and problems of history may be discussed. The bearing of facts and the direction and force of historical movements can be pointed out. In truth, the relations of facts are but a broader view of the facts themselves. Here, too, will come

in some of the lessons and teachings of history, political and moral. Instruction need not be made quite as pictorial and striking as before. Finally, care should be taken in the secondary school to form habits of accuracy and thoroughness in the ascertainment of facts ; the difference between a fact and an opinion about it, or a conclusion drawn from it, must be duly appreciated ; in other words, secondary instruction should lay the foundation for historical investigation.

Of the third stage of education, a few words will here suffice.

The advance from the secondary school to the college is not unlike the advance from the elementary school to the high school or the academy. Due regard will now be paid to the growth of the mind, both in the choice of materials and in the methods of presentation. Facts of a more general, complex, and abstract nature are in place ; also their broader relations. These facts and relations will suggest still larger and more difficult questions and problems. Society assumes much of the prominence that, in the beginning, was accorded to the individual man. Broader and deeper views of the state will now claim attention, and history will be correlated with other subjects, as economics, constitutional law, and political philosophy. No pains should be spared to form right methods of study and to stimulate the spirit of investigation. The time has come when the student may comprehend the meaning of Professor Seeley.

In history everything depends upon turning narrative into problems. So long as you think of history as a mere chronological narrative, so long you are in the old literary groove which leads to no trustworthy knowledge, but only to that pompous conventional romancing of which all serious men are tired. Break the drowsy spell of narrative ; ask yourself questions ; set yourself problems ; your mind will at once take up a new attitude ; you will become an investigator ; you will cease to be solemn and begin to be serious.

He can now understand that anecdotes, incidents, personal facts, tales, and biographies are but the raw material of the

history that is a guide to life and a high mental discipline, and by no means the whole of such material. He comprehends the words of Guizot, who, while heartily assenting that history is limited to facts, denies that all facts are material and visible ; holds that "there are moral, hidden facts which are no less real than battles, wars, and the public acts of government. Besides these individual facts, each of which has its proper name," he says, "there are others of a general nature, without a name, of which it is impossible to say that they happened in such a year or on such a day, and which it is impossible to confine within any precise limits, but which are just as much facts as the battles and public acts of which we have spoken."

That very portion, indeed, which we are accustomed to hear called the philosophy of history—which consists in showing the relation of events with each other, the chain which connects them, the causes and effects of events—this is history just as much as the description of battles and all the other exterior events which it recounts. Facts of this kind are undoubtedly more difficult to unravel ; the historian is more liable to deceive himself respecting them ; it requires more skill to place them distinctly before the reader ; but this difficulty does not alter their nature ; they still continue not a whit the less, for all this, to form an essential part of history.

So much in relation to the rule that requires facts to be graduated according to the age and mental development of the pupil.

II. Another criterion to follow in selecting material is, that only characteristic facts should be taught—facts that mark the man, the country, the age, and serve to distinguish him or it from other men or ages. History is moral knowledge, and constant deference must be paid to the truth ; it is a matter of veracity.

There are two ways in which this canon may be violated without teaching false facts. The first is, to teach facts that are not characteristic, and so convey false impressions. At

this point sound judgment and regard for truth or reality are a sufficient safeguard. The other violation is, wrongly to combine characteristic facts, or to teach them in disproportion. In some respects avoidance of this error will be found more difficult than avoidance of the previous one. Elementary instruction in history moves above the level of real life, and the pupil is likely to form the impression that history is more picturesque and romantic than it really is. This is especially true of children of strong and active imagination. In fact, disproportion, or lack of perspective, arising from various sources, is one of the familiar evils attending his mode of study. However, the romance with which children clothe historical personages is generally soon corrected by practical experience; while a strong dash of idealism in young life is much to be desired for numerous reasons. Still, the teacher needs just views and sound judgment.

It must not be supposed that this criterion shuts the teacher up to grave and sober facts alone. A bit of romance, poetry, anecdote, or story, will often throw more light upon a historical situation, or let you deeper into a man's heart and life, than a page of careful analysis. The story of Alfred and the cakes, of Bruce and the spider, of Sidney and the cup of water, of Marion and the sweet potatoes, are not only thoroughly characteristic, but they tell us more than a laborious description. Who could fully describe Mr. Lincoln, leaving out all the familiar stories?

It is sometimes said, and especially by foreign critics, that our country is commonplace, and lacking in the elements of deep human interest. No doubt our history as a whole is more practical and prosaic than that of Europe. The life of Europe also is less picturesque and poetic than it was in former centuries. But it is far from true that American history is devoid of interest for children and youth; it is rather rich in these elements. The struggles of Columbus in quest of a patron, his voyages and discoveries; the voyages and discoveries of the Cabots and of Hudson; the chival-

rous, far-sighted Raleigh; the story-telling adventurer John Smith; the Pilgrim Fathers; the Dutch traders at New York; Penn, Calvert, and Oglethorpe—are all characters interesting to children. The romantic search of Ponce de Leon for the fountain of youth, and of De Soto for gold and a powerful Indian kingdom like that of the Montezumas that he might conquer, abound in picturesque and striking features. The labors of Champlain in founding Canada, and of the Jesuits in their zeal for the souls of the savages, La Salle and the discovery of the Great West, have a perennial attraction. The early Indian wars present interesting characters and high qualities. The Revolution is rich in good material. Pioneer life and the tales of the border, as well as our later national struggles, may be drawn upon to excellent advantage.

In that suggestive yet exasperating chapter of his Education entitled *What Knowledge is of Most Worth?* Mr. Herbert Spencer expresses his profound contempt for the history taught thirty years ago in the schools of England. The historical information commonly given, he said, is almost valueless for purposes of guidance. Scarcely any of the facts set down in the school histories give any clew to the right principles of political action. The biographies of monarchs throw little light upon the science of society. Familiarity with court intrigues, plots, usurpations, and the like, with attending personalities, aid very little in elucidating the principles upon which national welfare depends. Neither *The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*, nor all other accounts of battles that history mentions, would enable the voter to vote more judiciously at the next election. Battles are squabbles for power. Such facts are unorganizable, and can be of no service in establishing principles of conduct, which is the chief use of facts; they may amuse, but they do not instruct. Proper history is mainly omitted, not only from these works but also from the more ambitious ones written for adults. What we are really concerned to know is the natural history of events. We want all the facts that

explain how nations grow and organize themselves. We want as full accounts as possible about governments and churches, but as little gossip about the men who have conducted them as may be. Industrial systems and acts should be delineated, and also the amusements and the morals of the people as illustrated in laws, habits, proverbs, and deeds. The only history that is of practical value is descriptive sociology. The highest office that the historian can discharge is to furnish the material for a comparative sociology, and for subsequent determinations of the ultimate laws to which social phenomena conform. The common citizen lacks not only the materials for sociology, but also the very conception of what it is, and all because history and related subjects are badly taught.

Such is a fair summary of the views relating to history presented in this celebrated essay. Considered with reference to colleges and universities, these views are of great value; considered with reference to primary and grammar schools, they are wholly erroneous, misleading, and impracticable. Still further, Spencer's method would also fail in the academy or the high school, although the pupil's logical power has now become more developed than in the grades below.

First, Mr. Spencer calls for a wholly disproportionate number of abstract facts. Many of his facts are not elementary facts at all, but logical facts, reached by careful and more or less difficult trains of reasoning. To be sure, these facts and processes are very valuable and have their place, but all things according to their proper measure. For all stages of teaching, and especially the first and second ones, too little is made of the personal element. Historical action consists of the doings of men and women, and not of the operations of impersonal agents or general laws. The logical element is made too prominent, at least until the college or university has been reached. Mr. Spencer assumes that the common school boy possesses powers of analysis and synthesis that he does not possess. Not only can not such a

schoolboy co-ordinate and systematize the abstract conceptions supposed, but he can not even form them. He must move more in the objective world of transactions, and less in the subjective world of ideas. Possibly it is true that descriptive sociology is the only history that has practical value, although it may well be doubted; it may be true—and here we are on much surer ground—that history teaching does not point up to sociology as it should do; but it is absolutely certain that the teacher who begins his instruction with Mr. Spencer's ideal immediately in view will never reach his goal.

Mr. Ransome, in the preface to his *Elementary History of England*, commits a mistake similar to Mr. Spencer's. He regards history as essentially the history of political growth; literature, anecdote, manners and customs being mere surplusage. "The human heart is much the same," he says, "whether it dresses in silk or broadcloth, and arbitrary taxation is as much a grievance whether the payers wear frock coats or shirts of mail. . . . Even the bloodiest of battles, if it lead to nothing, is less attractive to the average schoolboy than the story how, through the tenacity and foresight of his ancestors, he will have the privilege of keeping his own money in his own pocket, unless it is voted for public purposes by his accredited representatives." An English reviewer exposes the serious mistake here made in a few sentences that set the whole subject at once in its proper light.

We have never met with the schoolboy who would rather read of *Scutage* than the battle of Otterburn, or took more interest in Benevolences than in Flodden Field. The point at issue turns on the age of the pupil, and our protest is directed against any attempt to teach political history—history proper, if you will—before the age of thirteen or fourteen at the earliest. Up till this let us have biography, battles, incidents, anecdotes. Herodotus precedes Thucydides; from the Lays of Ancient Rome we pass to Niebuhr and Mommsen. Fortunately, Mr. Ransome is better than his theories, and in the first few pages we have the old stories of Angles

and angels, Alfred and the cakes, and the (comparatively) new story of the wild duck that built her nest in one of the Roman *balnea* at Bath. These are the parts that will stick in the memory; and all about shire-moots and town-moots, the Assize of Clarendon and the Assize of Arms, will possibly gain marks, but leave no marks behind. . . .

History for the child is to start from the present—from the known and visible, from the existing state and the local government of the place where he lives, just as geography should start from his native village and from the river and hills near by.

It is true that history has not been so taught as to yield its fullest guidance value. It is also true that undue stress has been laid on battles, anecdotes of distinguished persons, and gossip. At the same time, these can not be dismissed so contemptuously as Mr. Spencer dismisses them. To be sure, many battles stand for little in the history of the race, but this is by no means true of all. It would be difficult to exaggerate the issues that hung on the battle of Marathon, the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, the triumph of Rome over Carthage, or the defeat of the Saracens by Charles Martel. The fall of Constantinople into the hands of the Turks, the resistance of the Dutch to Spain, the Civil War in England, and the American Revolution were followed by far-reaching results. Mr. Ransome's limitation of history to political growth is Dr. Freeman's mistake over again. No person is likely to commit the errors into which Mr. Spencer falls, who has had practical experience in teaching children history. In this branch of education the Germans are very successful, and they teach both universal and German history to elementary pupils chiefly in the form of biography.

CHAPTER V.

METHODS OF TEACHING.

References.—Hall, Freeman, Klemm, Compayré, Currie, Fitch, Barnes, Gordy and Twitchell, and Davidson: previous references. Bain: Education as a Science, VIII., Practical Essays, VII. (The Art of Teaching); Trainer: United States History by the Brace Method; Prince: Methods of Instruction and of Organization of the Schools of Germany, X.; Foster: The Seminary Method of Original Study in the Historical Sciences, as Illustrated from Church History; Fling: The Academy, IV., 129, 212, (The German Historical Seminary. These articles give an interesting account of the seminary organizations and methods of Prof. Maurenbrecher, of Leipsic); Fredericq: Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Fifth Series, X. (Notes and Impressions concerning Advanced Instruction in History in England and Scotland), Eighth Series, V., VI., X. (The Study of History in Germany and France, and The Study of History in Belgium and Holland); H. B. Adams: Johns Hopkins University Studies, Second Series, I., II., (Special Methods of Historical Study, and New Methods of Studying History); White: Johns Hopkins Studies, Fifth Series, XII. (History and Politics); C. K. Adams: Papers of the American Historical Association, IV., No. 1 (Recent Historical Work in the Colleges and Universities of Europe and America); Schouler: Papers of the American Historical Association, IV., No. 3 (The Spirit of Historical Research); Rollins: The Academy, I., 133 (American History in Preparatory Schools); Hart: id., II., 256, 306 (History in High and Preparatory Schools); Burgess: id., III., 293 (The Method of Teaching College Preparatory History); Mrs. Barnes: id., IV., 285 (General History in High Schools); Hudson: id., III., 120 (History and Political Science); Salmon: id., V., VI., 310, 238 (Teaching of History in Academies and Colleges); Winterburn: id., VI., 148 (History Work

in High Schools); Tout: *The Educational Review*, III., 199 (A Short Analysis of English History); Hughes: *Education*, II., 410 (Topical Teaching of History); Porter: *id.*, III., 136 (The Study of History); Greenwood: *id.*, VI., 23 (Teaching History); Fisher, *id.*, VI., 588 (Universal History); Judson: *id.*, VI., 19 (Teaching History in Secondary Schools); Hall: *id.*, VII., 470 (History of the Civil War, What and How much should be Taught?); Thorpe: *id.*, VI., 86 (Teaching of American History); Gardner: *id.*, VIII., 547, 663, IX., 35, 109 (Outline Notes of the Renaissance and of the Reformation); Lowry: *id.*, VII., 447 (Philosophy of State and of History); Thorpe; *id.*, VIII., 351 (History and Economics in Manual Training Schools); Wallace: *id.*, IX., 346 (Study of History through Biography); Mowry: *id.*, IX., 134 (The Teacher's Independent Study of History).

It is quite commonly conceded by competent judges that in no other schools are such substantial results reached in teaching history as in those of Germany. It will help us on our way to glance at the general features of the instruction that they furnish.

The first thing to be remarked is, that in the best of these schools the teacher in the beginning is the sole agent of instruction. No room is found for a text-book, but especially trained teachers conduct the pupil over a carefully prepared course of study.

The second thing is, that the primary course is wholly biographical; the lessons are all narratives, tales, stories, and biographies of important historical personages. At the end of two years, two lessons having been given a week, it is found that a large number of valuable facts have been fixed in the pupil's mind; and that the pupil, instead of finding the lessons dry and tiresome, has rather found them a source of positive pleasure and recreation.

At the age of twelve a step forward is taken. The teacher now conducts the pupil the second time over the former course, but with a somewhat different end in view; the individual man falls a little into the background, while the nation moves forward. For example, the subject is now the story of the second Punic war—not the story of Hannibal.

More attention is paid to historical connection, and particularly to causal connection. The range of facts is expanded and amplified. At the end of three years more the pupil, being now fifteen years of age, has made two surveys of universal history, one smaller and one larger. While he is making the second survey, the teacher gives him a little pamphlet, commonly of the teacher's own preparation, a mere sketch of dates and names, to help him to retain and recall the main points of the oral lessons; and this is the only text-book.

The three or four years that now follow are given to enlarging and supplementing the outline that has been so thoroughly inculcated. In addition the pupil may, under direction, take up and carefully pursue the history of his own country, or some particular historical period, as the Reformation, or of the French Revolution—that is, specialization in a mild form now begins.

Dr. L. R. Klemm reports the excellence of the historical instruction in a school that he visited in Rhenish Prussia. The method followed, which was in a C grammar, or sixth grade, he thus describes :

1. A biographical narrative was given by the teacher, who spoke in very simple, appropriate language, but feelingly, with the glow of enthusiasm and the chest-tone of conviction. He made each pupil identify himself with the hero of the story. The map was frequently used or referred to. Bits of poetry taken from the Reader were interwoven, and circumstances of our time, as well as persons of very recent history, were mentioned at proper occasions. The attention was breathless.

2. The story was then repeated by pupils, who were now and then interrupted by leading questions. The answers were again used to develop new thoughts not brought out by the first narration. Particularly was it cause and effect, and the moral value of certain historical actions which claimed the attention of the teacher. To me it was very instructive to see these children search for analogous cases in human life as they knew it.

3. The pupils were led to search in their stores of historical

knowledge for analogous cases, or cases of decided contrast. This gave me an insight into the extent of their knowledge. When, for instance, certain civil virtues were spoken of, they mentioned cases which revealed a very laudable familiarity with history. But all their knowledge had been grouped around a number of centers—that is, great men. That is to say, their knowledge had been gained through biographies.

4. The pupils were told to write, in a connected narration, what they had just learned. This proved a fertile composition exercise, because the pupils had something to write about—a thing that is not quite so frequent in schools as it seems desirable.

The teacher who gave Dr. Klemm this outline also furnished him with a statement of the principles that should underlie instruction in history.

The aim should be “to nourish and strengthen all the powers of the soul, *interest*, *emotion*, and *volition*.” “The pupil’s intellect is increased by making him familiar with historical deeds,” “by affording comparisons and making distinctions, by causing keen judgment and correct conclusions.” “The pupil’s heart is influenced by instruction in history, because many great, sublime, noble, and beautiful actions and motives are presented, which cause pleasure and lead to imitation, unconsciously to the pupil.” “The pupil’s will-power is greatly stimulated by instruction in history, because he is warned and inspired by truth, right, and duty, for love of country and his fellow-men.”

Discussing the conditions necessary to secure these ends, this teacher presented the following points :

1. That the teacher of history be a person whose heart is full of patriotism, and beats strongly for truth, right, and duty.
2. That the instruction be not a mere recital of names and dates, of battles and acquisitions of land, nor dissertations upon abstract ideas and generalities, but, above all, a simple narration of deeds and events, and a glowing description of persons and circumstances.
3. That the teacher connect the new historical knowledge with circumstances and conditions, such as are either known to the pupils or are near enough at hand to draw them into the discussion.
4. That

the pupil should not be allowed to remain receptive, but must be induced to be active in this study. 5. That the teacher should induce his pupils to compare similar and dissimilar actions and persons, and thereby cause judgment upon cause and effect from a moral or ethical standpoint, so that not merely the intellect be developed, but also the heart and the will. 6. That instruction in history be brought into organic connection with the study of language: for this reason, reading is to be brought in as an assistant. Recitations of patriotic poems and ballads can be woven in profitably, and that geography must aid history is self-evident.

To this last condition I may add that, in the case of children and young persons, the poem is a most effective form of teaching. Metrical composition, like other rhythmical movements, takes fast hold of the mind, and all the more if really poetic. Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, the best of the Scottish ballads, as Chevy Chase and the Battle of Otterburn, and Paul Revere's Ride, may be given as examples. The volumes edited by Mr. Longfellow, entitled Poems of Places, may be searched with good results by both the teacher of geography and of history.

Such is the preparation that the German school gives for that matchless work in history which is the praise of the German universities. It will be seen that a much longer time is given to the subject than in our schools; but it is not too long if thorough instruction is to be secured.

The Herbart-Ziller school of pedagogists, who lay such great stress upon history, say instruction should begin at the beginning of school life. Holding that the child's love of stories is the first awakening of his mind to the historic interest, they make it their first endeavor to stimulate this love by systematic story-telling. The art of telling a story they regard as the final test of a teacher's skill, and they assign it a prominent place in normal-school instruction. Still further, they have worked out a primary programme in accordance with their pedagogical scheme. They have arranged a number of Grimm's tales, which they make the center of instruction for the first school year. These stories

are told and retold by the teacher, reproduced item by item by the children, and around them are clustered moral and religious sentiments, material information, and illustrative object-lessons. The next year, connected stories from Robinson Crusoe are treated in the same manner. Then come selected tales from the Old Testament, and still later selections from the Odyssey, the Norse Sagas, Shakespeare, Herodotus, Livy, Xenophon, and others in due order. In this way the historical sense is developed and centers of interest created, before technical instruction begins.

Several points occurring in this account of German schools challenge consideration. The first is, that it does not so much matter when the first lessons are given, provided they are of the right kind. The second is, that the first connected school lessons should relate to the pupil's own country or home region. Such lessons will throw a glow of interest upon the parallel lessons in geography and stimulate patriotism. The third is, that the story should be the form in which the instruction is cast. Reference has been made in an earlier chapter to the marked influence of history in developing patriotism in the Jews. It may be added that no people ever found more admirable material for such a purpose. The stories of the Old Testament—of Abraham, Joseph, Moses, David, and Daniel—that cling so closely to the memory, are parts of their national history, and not merely, as with us, moral and religious lessons. The supervising authority makes the number of facts to be taught, and even the particular facts, as definite as possible—it would seem too definite. For example, in the elementary schools of Berlin one hundred and sixteen particular dates are required to be memorized. In the elementary school little use is made of the text-book. The Germans keep clearly in view, as an American writer puts it, that “at least three fourths of all the time spent by a boy of twelve in trying to learn a hard lesson out of a book is time thrown away. Perhaps one fourth of the time is devoted to more or less desperate and conscious effort; but the large remaining portion is

dawdled away in thinking of the last game of ball and longing for the next game of tag."

Because only one fourth of the time that a boy of twelve spends in learning a history lesson, or any other lesson, out of a book is efficacious, it does not follow that he should make no use of books. The end of scholastic discipline is power to get all the knowledge and truth, thought and fancy, wit and wisdom, from the printed page that it holds—an end that can be reached only when the teacher keeps it steadily in view from the beginning. Of necessity, a child's first tuition is oral, but he must be progressively introduced to books. Hence the teacher who persists in saving for the present the time dawdled away over the book, will lose it in the end. A child can learn to use books only by using them. The judicious mingling of oral and book lessons is indeed no easy matter. Doubtless too much stress was formerly placed on book lessons; possibly too little stress is placed upon them at present. At least, a well-trained pupil twelve years of age should begin to depend upon a historical text-book. Of course, he has been reading books of tales, stories, and the like from the time that he could first read at all.

The advantages of oral teaching are vivacity and interest; the disadvantages are vagueness and incompleteness. The pupil studying history is almost certain to get too many indefinite and general ideas, and too few fixed and definite facts. This failure the German teacher seeks to overcome by making the path to be trodden plain and straight, and then by going over it again and again. It should be noticed also that the printed outline which he puts into the child's hand is the skeleton of the instruction. The disadvantages of the text-book in the upper classes of the elementary schools are lack of intelligence and interest—a fatal defect unless it can be overcome; the advantages are the opportunity for exactness and thoroughness. The two elements should be thoroughly blended—text-book lessons and oral illustration. The extremes to be avoided are fact-cramming on the one part, and flowing talk on the other.

The topical method of study has gained considerable currency. Discarding the text-book, the teacher prints or writes on slips of paper, or puts on the blackboard, the topics that form the subjects of the succeeding lessons, and then sends the class to the library, or such other sources of information as they have at hand, furnishing them, of course, the needed hints and directions regarding the choice of books and their use. Then the pupils report at the next recitation, sometimes orally, and sometimes in writing. It is a sort of a rudimentary seminary, of which more will soon be said.

Well handled, this method has undeniable excellences. It creates interest and the spirit of investigation ; it familiarizes the pupil with the use of books and libraries ; it supplies, so far as the use of different authorities can do so, a useful check on hasty opinion and over-confidence, and is a good introduction to the methods of self-culture. The evils of the method are equally obvious. It is accompanied by more or less aimless effort. Thoroughly worked, it consumes much time. It is apt to land the pupil in the region of vague information and general impressions rather than of definite knowledge. The facts and ideas acquired are little likely to be well organized or integrated in the mind. On the whole, the topical method in an exclusive sense can not be recommended at any stage of progress. An exclusive use of it in the elementary school would be preposterous, in the secondary school absurd, in the college a mistake. Still, at no stage of progress after the preliminary one should it be wholly discarded. Some topical work may be assigned in the elementary school, more in the high school and academy, and still more in the college.

The principles already stated will enable us to judge of the lecture. Here the first thing to be said is that the formal lecture, as a regular means of instruction, should have no place below the college, no matter what the subject of instruction may be. It first liquefies in vague impressions, and then evaporates in talk ; or, if not, then the teacher must deliver the matter so slowly that the pupil can write

down everything that is important, thus in effect making a text-book as he goes along. As soon, therefore, as the pupil is able to use a text-book to advantage, why not supply him with one already prepared, making it the basis of the instruction, and adding the needed oral amplification ?

In the college the case is somewhat different. Here two points may be urged in favor of the lecture. The first is, that a good lecturer will generate more interest and enthusiasm than a teacher conducting book recitations, and so will tend to send his students to the library to investigate for themselves. The other is, that, seizing bold facts and handling large generalizations, he will help the student thoroughly to unify and organize the matter which it is most important for him to remember. A good lecturer can do both of these things if his students have the requisite preparation—a phrase that here means considerable historical knowledge, as well as mental discipline, and experience in note-taking. The lecture is not the proper vehicle for conveying elementary knowledge of history. Experience often shows that courses of lectures that have been taken with interest and are recalled with pleasure, have left little behind them save mistaken notions and vague ideas. The lecturer will therefore find it extremely advantageous to put into his students' hands a text-book of moderate size, running along the line of his course, requiring them to read thoroughly designated portions of it in advance. The book will serve as a path-breaker. For example, Seebohm's Protestant Revolution would admirably guide a course of lectures on the Reformation. References to the needed authorities will be given as a matter of course. Or, if the lecturer can not find a hand-book to his mind, he should at least furnish his students with a printed syllabus of his lectures, both to assist them in breaking the ground and to furnish a mechanism for the distribution of the matter.

Of its kind, I know nothing that is better than Dr. Alexander Bain's essay entitled *The Art of Study*. I venture to quote three or four short paragraphs ; save the last one, it

will be seen that they have no exclusive reference to history :

Our first maxim is, "Select a text-book-in-chief." The meaning is, that when a large subject is to be overtaken by book study alone, some one work should be chosen to apply to, in the first instance, which work should be conned and mastered before any other is taken up. There being, in most subjects, a variety of good books, the thorough student will not be satisfied in the long run without consulting several, and perhaps making a study of them all ; yet it is unwise to distract the attention with more than one, while the elements are to be learned. In geometry the pupil begins upon Euclid, or some other compendium, and is not allowed to deviate from the single line of his author. If he is once thoroughly at home on the main ideas and the leading propositions of geometry, he is safe in dipping into other manuals, in comparing the differences of treatment, and in widening his knowledge by additional theorems, and by various modes of demonstration. . . .

Undoubtedly the best of all ways of learning anything is to have a competent master to dole out a fixed quantity every day, just sufficient to be taken in, and no more ; the pupils to apply themselves to the matter so imparted, and to do nothing else. The singleness of aim is favorable to the greatest rapidity of acquirement ; and any defects are to be left out of account, until one thread of ideas is firmly set in the mind. Not infrequently, however, and not improperly, the teacher has a text-book in aid of his oral instructions. To make this a help, and not a hindrance, demands the greatest delicacy ; the sole consideration being that the pupil must be kept *in one single line of thought*, and never be required to comprehend, on the same point, conflicting or varying statements. Even the foot-notes to a work may have to be disregarded in the first instance. They may act like a second author, and keep up an irritating friction. . . .

The subjects that depend for their full comprehension upon a certain method and order of details are numerous, and include the most important branches of human culture. The sciences, in mass, are avowedly of this character ; even such departments as theology, ethics, rhetoric, and criticism have their definite form ; and until the mind of the student is fully impressed with this, all the particu-

lars are vague and chaotic, and comparatively useless for practical application. So, any subject cast in a *polemic* form must be received and held in the connection thereby given to it. If the arguments *pro* and *con* fall out of their places in the mind of the reader, their force is missed or misconceived.

History is pre-eminently a subject for method, and therefore involves some such plan as is here recommended. Every narrative read otherwise than for mere amusement, as we read a novel, should leave in the mind (1) the chronological sequence (more or less detailed) and (2) the causal sequence—that is, the influences at work in bringing about the events. These are best gained by application to a single work in the first place; other works being resorted to in due time.

It will be observed that Dr. Bain lays down three fundamental propositions, viz.: 1. In the early days of education instruction must be narrow. 2. It must be thorough. 3. Only when the pupil is “thoroughly at home on the main ideas,” only when “one thread of ideas is firmly set in the mind,” only when “one single line of thought,” has been wrought into the mental substance, should the teacher begin to be discursive and “broaden” the work. In history, what folly to fall to comparing, interpreting, and discussing before the pupil has amassed a store of facts on which to set his reflective faculties at work! In dealing with the history of a country or nation, the first thing to be done is to fix in the pupil’s mind firmly the main points—an outline—a framework—in which he can dispose and arrange minor facts and details as he requires them; or, to change the figure, to provide his mind with a supply of hooks and pegs on which he can hang up, in proper order and in due relation, new facts and ideas as he masters them.

It may be added that readers made up of lessons devoted to some one subject, as geography or history, no doubt have a certain use in schools. They are useful, however, as readers rather than as geographies or histories. Experience shows that ordinary reading lessons are not an effective vehicle of specific instruction in any branch of knowledge.

While the historical reader will supplement the regular instruction in history, it can not be made to take the place of the regular text-book.

In this survey the lesson must not be overlooked. The teacher should not encourage or permit the pupil to depend upon the language of an author, save where language is a real part of the substance. His business is not "to sit behind a book and hear pupils say their lessons." Recitations that closely follow the text commonly show that the attention has been fixed on the words rather than on the matter. A memory that lays hold of subject-matter should be stimulated rather than a merely verbal memory. Now and then we meet a mind that takes up everything, words and matter alike, but such minds are few and far between. In his teaching days General Garfield sometimes told of a student of his who commanded much admiration by a recitation of a two-and-a-half-page description of a theodolite, but who showed plainly enough before the close of the hour that he had merely committed to memory the words, and that he had no conception of the construction, adjustment, and use of the instrument that he had described with such volubility. Once more, the practice of picking out of students' minds the points of a lesson by special questions, and especially by questions which suggest the answer, can not be too strongly condemned. I recall some college students who often related with much glee how their professor, sitting behind Green's Short History, asked a halting student "Was there liberty?" and received the prompt reply, "There was liberty."

The proper method is to assign to each pupil a topic, requiring him to develop it in his own way, and then, when he has finished, to bring out by question and answer such points as need further attention, unless, indeed, he has made so poor a recitation that the topic should be assigned to a second pupil. In this way freedom, resource, and good preparation will be promoted. The recitations may be clumsy and halting at first, but they will soon gain in fullness and

freedom. Accordingly, a text-book that carefully analyzes the matter, especially a book that makes use of side-heads, is a distinct advantage ; and if such analysis is lacking, the teacher should show the class how to make one for themselves. The teacher may make out a list of topics on paper to be used in conducting the recitation ; but in no case should he suffer himself to become dependent upon his book. The oral amplification may be given as the topics pass by, or at the close of the lesson, as circumstances may determine.

Of quizzes, reviews, and examinations little need be said. It can not be held that they are more or less useful in teaching history than in teaching other subjects that are made up largely of fact material. The office of such exercises in brightening the memory and the imagination, and in more thoroughly organizing facts that have been acquired, thus constituting proper knowledge, is well understood by good teachers. It should, however, be plainly stated that the quiz is a necessary part of the lecture method when it is made truly effective.

Before passing to the final topic, it is important to observe that in the choice and combination of methods a great deal depends upon the teacher as well as upon the class. Good lecturers sometimes fail as text-book teachers, and perhaps good text-book teachers still more frequently fail as lecturers.

The Germans, deeply impressed by the value and even necessity to university students of original studies, invented the *Seminar*, as a means whereby such students could carry on such studies in various branches of knowledge, history included, under the direction of a competent professor. In its native country it has abundantly justified its invention. Translated to the United States, and baptized the "seminary," it is justifying itself over again. Only two or three things need be said about the historical seminary in this place.

The first is, that its proper function lies in the field of original work. From this it follows necessarily that the

students admitted to it should be picked students, not only mature of mind, but already well instructed in history and its methods, and able by reason of practice to carry on to advantage lines of independent study under general supervision. It follows also that the professor himself should be a picked man, well acquainted with original sources and other authorities, and capable of directing and inspiring students. These points it is important to state in the plainest language, because there is reason to fear a more or less general travesty of "seminary methods" the country over. The lecture has already made its way into some strange places, and we need not be surprised to see the seminary follow in its wake.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ORGANIZATION OF FACTS.

References.—See previous references to pedagogical writers and historical specialists. Also Guizot: History of Civilization (*passim*); Mace: Papers of the American Historical Association, V., No. III, (The Organization of Material). On Organization and Systematization, see the current text-writers on psychology.

A DISTINGUISHED French writer lately deceased, M. Taine, says the word "to organize," which he dates from the Revolution and the First Empire, "summarizes the success of well-ordered and distributive reason, the vast and happy effects of the art which consists in simplifying, classifying, and subtracting." No art is so necessary to the teacher, either in the sphere of administration or in the sphere of instruction. I shall first explain what this art is, and then make a particular application to history.

We may roughly divide school studies into two groups. Those of the first group begin with certain fundamental and intuitive ideas, and proceed by means of deduction. They are the proper logical studies, and the best examples of them are the pure mathematics. Mathematical data are definitions and axioms, facts of the mind and not of observation; the great aim of the teacher is to point out, and of the pupil to discover, the necessary relations existing between these data, and so to build them, and the other truths that are discovered on the way, into an orderly and symmetrical whole called algebra, or geometry. Such, in the mathematical sphere, is organization.

Studies of the second group begin with observed object-

ive facts, and proceed by induction. These data are empirical and not logical ideas. The primal mental operations are not those of intuition, conception, and reasoning, but observation and memory. Books are secondary sources of information, and can be understood only through a previously acquired store of primary and personal information. The facts that we have seen explain to us the facts which we hear or read. Examples of such studies are botany, zoölogy, the natural sciences generally, geography, and history.

The successful prosecution of any one of this second group of studies involves the accumulation of a large fund of facts, but also something more. Facts of themselves do not constitute proper knowledge; they are at best but information, and the man who possesses them in the largest abundance is not necessarily the best instructed man. Facts do not exist separate and alone either in Nature or history; they are always connected, and they can not be understood or explained out of their connections. The bones of the human body thrown loosely into a box are not a skeleton; a pile of dry plants is not an herbarium; they must be brought together and secured in their natural relations. The possession of a mass of botanical or geographical facts, no matter how large, does not make a man a botanist or a geographer; his facts must be organized, fact brought to its related fact, as bone to its related bone. In other words, these studies are not wholly empirical, but partly logical as well; the studies, in fact, do not exist until the many are reduced to the one, and unity is seen in diversity; until, that is, the primary data are viewed under a philosophical aspect. We speak of the organization of knowledge, sometimes forgetting, perhaps, that knowledge is the product of organization. Science has no place for *rudes et indigestas moles*.

Without its power of integration or organization the mind would be feeble indeed. As says Sir William Hamilton, "We are lost in the multitude of the objects presented to our observation, and it is only by assorting them in

classes that we can reduce the infinity of Nature to the finitude of mind." He quotes Anaxagoras, "The mind knows when it subdues its objects, when it reduces the many to the one"; and remarks himself, "All languages express the mental operations by words which denote a reduction of the many to the one," as "synthesis," "cogitate," "conceive," "comprehend," "cognize," and many more.

Too much stress can not be placed on organization as essential to real knowledge. But, further, it is as necessary to its retention as to its acquirement. The memory is unable to cope with much unrelated and discursive material—that is, facts can no more be remembered irrespective of their relations than they can be understood and explained. It is easier to remember two things in relation than either one separately. In fact, no one thing can be remembered separately. Within limits, we lighten the burden by increasing it. The operations of the memory are controlled by the laws of association; and the laws of association govern the organization of empirical data.

These two elements run parallel throughout the study of history, as throughout all other fact studies, but in quite different proportions in different periods. Facts continue to be the subject-matter to the end of the course; logical ideas are present at its beginning. The simplest narrative or tale involves at least two facts or incidents, and so the idea of time or succession. The facts of environment, or spatial relation, also occur at once, and the idea of cause is not long in appearing. While these ideas need not be made the subject of abstract thought, and at first should not be, they will nevertheless be present in the mind of the teacher, and will gradually work their way into the mind of the pupil.

Individual events compose a series of events; but to understand the events singly, it is as necessary to have a knowledge of the series as it is to have a knowledge of the individual facts in order to understand the series. All organized knowledge begins with learning a certain number of

facts and truths; and these must not be limited in their range, but comprehensive. No individual square mile or acre of the earth's surface can be explained in itself alone; no individual country, island, or continent can be thus described; to understand even the smallest geographical unit, one must have some knowledge of the whole globe. The moon can be described only in relation to the earth, the earth only in relation to the sun, the sun only in relation to its system and the heavens as a whole. No one can appreciate the significance of a missing link, or even have an idea of what a link is, until he has previously learned something of the chain of which it is a part. We can explain the growth and prosperity of a city only by taking account of the region that contributes to its population and wealth. A man at any particular period of his career—as Cromwell when he became Lord Protector, Napoleon when he assumed the imperial crown, or Lincoln when he was inaugurated President—is an absolute enigma, cut off from his own previous life and the life of his country. The earth brings forth fruit of herself, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. Thus, in all things there is an order of succession founded on the law formulated by Mr. Spencer: "There can be no correct idea of a part without a correct idea of the correlative whole."

We must learn some individual facts before we can take up the series; we must go from the individual to the general, and yet the individual is never fully understood until it is considered in connection with the general. Hence the teaching of history involves: (1) Fixing permanently in the mind those single facts that determine the general movement, or some selected portion of it; (2) study of the relations of these facts in the development of society; (3) a more thorough investigation of social and political elements, with a special reference to causal relations.

This analysis corresponds in a general way to the three stages of educational progress. The fact element will be found in the third stage, the logical element in the first

stage ; the characteristic differences being the kinds of facts and relations dealt with in the different stages and the relative stress laid upon them. What a distinguished pedagogist says of the acquisition of knowledge in general, is particularly true of geographical and historical knowledge :

The elementary school will always have the character of memory work stamped upon it, no matter how much the educational reformers may improve its methods. It is not easy to overvalue the impulse of such men as Pestalozzi and Froebel. But the child's mind cannot seize great syntheses. He bites off, as it were, only small fragments of truth at best. He gets isolated data, and sees only feebly the vast network of interrelation in the world. This fragmentary, isolated character belongs essentially to primary education. But just as surely does secondary education deal with relations and functions and processes. It is the stage of crude generalization. But college education strives to superinduce on the mind the habit of seeing the unity of things. The curriculum of the college is therefore called the philosophical faculty, using the word "faculty" in the French sense of the word *faculté*.*

Accordingly, the main thing that the teacher of history in the primary school has to do, and largely so in the secondary school, is to teach facts. The facts taught in these schools constitute the very foundations of the whole after superstructure. While facts do not make a man a historian, he cannot be a historian without them. Teachers of a philosophical turn may dislike this humble work ; they may speak of it contemptuously as "mere memorizing," but no real educator speaks slightly of the memory. The common sense of mankind rightly adjudges praise to the man having a rich store of information.†

* Dr. W. T. Harris : Report of Commissioner of Education, 1888-'89, lviii.

† The current depreciation of the memory is largely unreasonable and mischievous. To exalt the logical faculties is all right ; to belittle the faculties of retention and reproduction is all wrong. It is not impertinent to say that if a man has a fine memory there is no reason why he should be ashamed of it. Professor James may be quoted on the broader aspect of this subject :

No doubt a majority of teachers have heretofore committed a serious mistake at this point. They have striven by sheer force of repetition to crowd as many facts as possible into the pupil's mind. Nor were these facts always by any means well chosen. They paid little attention to the pupil's power of assimilation, and perhaps still less to the organization of what they taught. They largely lost the meaning of facts, the stream of thought, the life of the action, the interest of the story. Such teaching is unspeakably dry and uninteresting, and is worse than no teaching at all. It is far better to leave the child to such spontaneous interest in history as may spring up within him, than to blunt the edge of his mind with mere tables of dates and other indigestible material. The "philosophy of history," may be a large phrase for the elementary teacher, but what will lead up to it should find a place in the elementary school.

Things must be done in their proper time and according to their just measure. The old teachers whom I have criticised are not so far out of the way as those new ones who teach nothing that is definite or particular, but waste their time and effort in the vain endeavor to impart general views and large relations for which their pupils are not prepared. It is folly to speak of the relations existing between facts that the pupil does not know ; to mention cause and effect until the antecedent and consequent have been grasped ; to seek to organize materials that have never been gathered. With

"No one probably was ever effective on a voluminous scale without a high degree of this physiological retentiveness. In the practical as in the theoretic life, the man whose acquisitions *stick* is the man who is always achieving and advancing ; whilst his neighbors, spending most of their time in relearning what they once knew but have forgotten, simply hold their own. A Charlemagne, a Luther, a Leibnitz, a Walter Scott—any example, in short, of your quarto or folio editions of mankind—must needs have amazing retentiveness of the purely physiological sort. Men without this retentiveness may excel in the *quality* of their work at this point or at that, but will never do such mighty sums of it, or be influential contemporaneously on such a scale."—*Psychology*, vol. i, p. 660.

relations, as such, the teacher of history has nothing to do. Relations are no more history than the tendons which hold his bones together are a man's anatomy.

It is also necessary to observe that the organization of knowledge is not the same thing as discoursing about its organization. Either of these things may be present without the other. The wise teacher will put facts in their proper relations from the very first stage of his work ; he will direct the attention of the pupil to relations progressively as the pupil is ready to receive them ; he will give them the largest place when he comes to deal with methods of historical investigation.

At the end of this chapter I may state the categories or principles with reference to which historical facts should be grouped or organized :

1. Time, or the chronological relation.
2. Place, or the geographical relation.
3. Cause and effect, or the causal relation.

This is exhaustive of the subject. However, as the personal element is so prominent, it will be wise, particularly in elementary work, to divide the third category, and to group such facts as conspicuously admit of it with reference to personal agents. Two cautionary remarks should be added.

The first is, that generalization must not be thrust out of its place. Such a work as Colonel Dodge's *Bird's-eye View of Our Civil War*, or Lavissee's *General View of the Political History of Europe*, is not a book for the beginner : a complete conspectus represents the end of historical study.

The second remark is, that the logical element in history must not be suffered to override the fact element. This is a point of no small danger, particularly in advanced study. Hamilton observes that the tendency to generalize our knowledge "is not only an effective means of discovery, but likewise an abundant source of error," illustrating the observation with numerous examples of the substitution of theory and hypothesis for fact. Guizot tells us, in a passage

that I shall quote at length in another place, that "nothing tortures history more than logic." Some one has pertinently observed that "a child has a healthy appetite for facts ; he likes action and story " ; the child should therefore be suitably served with facts, action, and story while he craves them, postponing theorizing until the time comes for theories.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TIME RELATION IN HISTORY : CHRONOLOGY.

References.—The best practical suggestions on the handling of dates are found in the pedagogical writers. Wells has good remarks; see also Schaff and Carlyle, previous references. Freeman: Four Lectures on European History and The Unity of History. For a division of our own history, The Epochs of American History Series may be commended. The numerous chronological schemes, charts, and dictionaries of dates give information rather than method. On the science of chronology and chronological systems, the articles on those subjects in the cyclopædias may be consulted.

HISTORY is dynamic, not static. It is action or movement. Hence the historian has by no means discharged his function when he has inventoried historical facts as they existed at a given time, or described a particular situation. He does indeed sometimes give such an inventory or description, but this he does on account of something that has gone before or of something that is to follow after.

All action or movement is in time. Without time the very idea is impossible. The mere facts of history as facts could be inventoried without regard to time, like the facts of geography or chemistry, and thus treated they might have a certain value; but such an inventory would not be history. There would be no life or action, no development or evolution, no progress or becoming. Chronology has therefore been called one of the two eyes of history.

The practical conclusion which we reach is, that the teacher of history must pay attention to time relations and

to dates. But what dates? how many dates? and how shall the dates be taught? Before attempting answers to these questions, we must pay attention to some preliminary matters.

The child's first lesson in chronology is the formation of the ideas expressed by the words "before" and "after," or the relation of succession. He learns that some things *are*, that others *were*, and afterward generalizes these ideas as the present and the past. His next lesson is to mark more definitely the relation of past events to the present; he now struggles with the question, How long? He becomes familiar with the phrases "this morning," "yesterday," "a week ago," and the like, slowly finding out their meaning by personal experience. At first the statements that Solomon lived twenty-five hundred years ago, Julius Cæsar two thousand years ago, and Washington a century ago, mean little more than that these men are now dead, and that they died in the order named. Practically, you might as well say that they lived twenty-five years, twenty years ago, and one year ago. The steps by which the child makes his way along this chronological path should be analyzed.

1. The succession of one's bodily sensations, as hunger and thirst and weariness, the order of outward events, and the train of his ideas, are his first time measures. Rosalind is a good psychologist when she tells Orlando that time trots hard with a young maid between the contract of her marriage and the day it is solemnized, that he ambles with a priest who lacks Latin and a rich man who has not the gout, that he gallops hard with a thief to the gallows, and stands still with lawyers in their vacations. That is, time moves at a more rapid pace with those whose minds are fully occupied, provided the occupation is not disagreeable. But when events have passed into memory the rule changes; the time limits within which we can recall many events or thoughts seem widely separated, and *vice versa*. But these mental time measures are too vague and misleading to answer practical purposes. Still, they are never wholly aban-

done. A man without a watch lost in the forest, or working in a field on a cloudy day, takes account of just such experiences.

2. The next thing is the adoption of some fixed measure or measures. These are found in Nature : the day, the Latin for which means "shine," the month, or moon, which signifies "measurer," and the year, which in Latin is a ring or circle. Then, we make artificial divisions or multiples of these natural measures : the hour, minute, and second, the week, the Olympiad, the jubilee, the decade, and the century. Artificial changes are also made in the units themselves : thus the lunar and the calendar months do not coincide, and the solar year and the civil year are not quite of the same length.

Experience only can teach an individual the real meaning and application of these measures. While the successions of sensation and ideas can by no means take the place of definite time standards, they are just as essential to understanding them as experiences of color and sound are to an understanding of the color and sound vocabularies. Thus, life alone enables us to form the conception of history.

The process just described is similar to that by which a man measures distance with his eye. He learns by observation that commonly about so many objects are seen in a mile or on an acre of ground ; looking upon an expanse stretched out before him he recognizes once, twice, or thrice that number of objects within certain limits ; and then, observing or assuming that the objects thus presented are scattered about as thickly as he is accustomed to see them, he concludes that the distance is one, two, or three miles, or the surface one, two, or three acres. Or, if he thinks the objects now presented are closer or less close together, he makes the necessary allowance. To tell a person who has always lived within the four walls of a house that one place is a hundred miles from another gives him nothing more than verbal information ; but if he has ridden across the

country on the cars, and has thus formed some empirical distance measures, the language will mean something to him.

3. The next step in the evolution of a system of chronology is to fix upon a starting point from which to measure. Every child makes the present his first chronological era ; he counts backward. For the purposes of history, there are two fatal objections to this mode of procedure : one is, that the place of beginning is constantly changing ; the other, that it violates the order of historical movement by requiring the mind to go up-stream. Hence we must transport ourselves into the past. The Jews count from the creation of the world, Christians from the birth of Christ, Moham-medans from the flight of the Prophet from Mecca. In every such case the starting point or the era is purely arbitrary, and may rest upon a mistaken notion. In fact, Christ was born eighteen hundred and ninety-seven, and not eighteen hundred and ninety-three, years ago.

4. Having provided ourselves with a set of standards, or a measuring line duly divided and marked, and adopted a base line, we are now ready to measure and to mark the distances of the events that we wish to locate, both from the base and from one another. Wrought out in due form such a scheme is called a system of chronology, which may be defined as an arrangement or exhibit of various events that have occurred in history, deemed important, in the order of their succession, with the intervals of time from one to another and from the era previously agreed upon suitably designated. A chronological chart has therefore been aptly compared to a geographical map. The era corresponds to the prime meridian ; the centuries, years, and days to the ordinary meridians. The value of the chart and of the map alike depends less upon the choice of an era or prime meridian and the length of the measures employed than upon the carefulness and accuracy with which the details are worked out. If a date is lost, then the event for which it stands can no more be definitely fixed with reference to other events, than we can

locate the fabled islands of the Atlantic with reference to Europe and America.

It thus becomes quite clear that a chronological scheme is essential to accurate history. Thus, the meaning of the phrase, "chronology is one of the two eyes of history," becomes manifest. Such a scheme is one of the three machines, so to speak, that the student uses to assort and place his facts. Entering a mail car attached to a Michigan Central train bound westward from Detroit, you see a clerk standing before a group of boxes, each one appropriately marked and the whole looking much like a cabinet of open drawers, engaged in "throwing" mail. With astonishing dexterity he throws the proper pieces to the boxes marked Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor, Jackson, etc. Similarly a chronologist tosses into the boxes of his chronological scheme the events, men, ideas, institutions, and doctrines that he comes upon in the course of his studies. The veteran student has his scheme ready made; the neophyte makes his scheme as he accumulates his facts. Perhaps it is needless to say that much time and care are consumed in its fabrication, and that the teacher should lend the pupil intelligent co-operation. Such is a system of scientific chronology. Such a system, more or less definitely worked out, every historical student must have, but it would be a great mistake to suppose that such a system rigidly adhered to or followed is either a necessary or a wise expedient. There are other elements to be considered in assorting and organizing historical facts.

Chronology proper takes notice of time only: it pays no heed to either place or cause and effect. The chronologist arranges facts, no matter where they may come from or how disconnected they may be, in the strict order of succession. His scheme is therefore wholly artificial, wholly external to the facts themselves. The lines that he draws across his chart are no more parts of history than the meridians and parallels drawn upon a map are parts of the earth's surface. There are such things as geographical and causal relations, such things as the unity and continuity

of history determined by these relations, from which it follows that, if the method of the chronologist is rigidly adhered to, the highest form of history possible would be a chronicle.

Here we come to the important question, How should history be written and studied? Historians have followed three methods—the external, the internal, and a combination of these two.

The mere annalist sets events down by years, in the order of their occurrence. Livy's History of Rome some editor arbitrarily divided into decades, or groups of ten books each, for the sole reason that the first, twenty-first, and thirty-first books marked the beginnings of important periods and are opened by short introductions. The Magdeburg Centurists and their imitators divided the history of the Church into centuries. Even the learned Mosheim followed that method in his Ecclesiastical History. The century method is more rational than the decade method; still it often compels a total disregard of internal connections, while forcing facts that are unrelated into a mechanical union. Moreover, besides doing violence to subject-matter, all such methods cramp the powers of the writer and of the student. They are no more a part of history than a diver's armor is a part of the diver.

Other writers have followed the internal method, following as a criterion the genetic development of thought and events. These writers make use of the period, the age, and the epoch in assorting and arranging their facts. The relations of these divisions of time are not definitely determined. The period is most frequently employed, and it alone need be considered in this discussion.

The great advantage of the period is, that the term does not connote a fixed length of time, like year, decade, or century. Some periods are long, some short. It is rarely possible to tell in years how long a period is; still it has a beginning and an end, and is marked by certain features giving it a unity that makes it possible for the mind to grasp

it as a whole. These features may be religious, political, or military, or a blending of various elements. The Protestant Reformation was a political, a national, an intellectual, and an economical movement as well as a religious one. Obviously, therefore, the conception of the period is essential to the right interpretation of history.

The disadvantages of the strict internal method are no less obvious than its advantages. It is too subjective, setting at naught all relations but those of internal connection. It fails to bring facts into relation that lie outside of the chain of cause and effect. It runs in special channels, leaving out of account parallel but unrelated series of facts. It gives us a searching inward look that is deficient in breadth of view. What is more, it has no definite means of marking time or of measuring historic intervals. In fact, left to itself the internal method is helpless to keep track of its own results or to preserve them in any definite form. More than this, it is even limited in its account of development. Time is of the essence of history; and there is no escaping the questions, "When?" and "How long?"

Happily the two methods do not absolutely exclude each other; each completes the other, and the student must therefore secure the advantages both of the external and the internal method. The student of history, in contradistinction to the chronologist, does not stand in front of a cabinet of boxes each of the same capacity, marked "first," "second," and "third"; he stands rather before a series of posts marked 1096, 1453, 1492, 1517, 1607, 1688, 1776, 1861, etc., and throws his facts to them. These dates mean the first Crusade, the fall of Constantinople, the discovery of America, the Reformation, Jamestown, the English Revolution, the American Revolution, and our Civil War. They stand prominent in the periods into which the student has found it convenient to divide history. In other words, he associates a multitude of facts with leading dates like those that have been mentioned. The events so associated are of course those that do not require, for common purposes a closer

identification. The historian will indeed mark as clearly as possible the time when Columbus went to Lisbon, to the Gold Coast, and to Spain, and the dates of his second, third and fourth voyages, as well as of many other voyages ; but the general student, or reader at least, will find it sufficient to set up the year 1492, and to group many minor facts around it. In this way the great dates of history, and not a mere scheme of artificial compartments, control the grouping of events. In this way dates mark periods. In this way we satisfy many of the demands of both chronological exactness and of internal connection.

To a considerable extent the historical period meets the demand of history. Even well-educated men are often unable to do more than to place facts in their proper period, or to throw them into their own group ; history could be written without a more definite chronology than this, but it would be defective. Hence it becomes necessary to mark as closely as we can the beginning and the end of periods. Still, we must remember that the dates fixed upon for this purpose are after all partly arbitrary and artificial. History is an evolution ; it is marked by unity and continuity, and we can not divide it into periods in the exact manner of a surveyor cutting up a field into village lots. We call 1517 the beginning of the Reformation, for example, but we are not unaware that this is giving that year a certain factitious importance.

The observation last made leads to the broader one, that it has been a common fault of historians to draw their lines of demarcation both too straight and too heavy. Human progress is not made by leaps and bounds, but by slow and sometimes imperceptible stages ; and the great periods of history are separated from one another by lines sometimes almost imperceptible, and always wavy and shaded. Rome did not fall in a day any more than it was built in a day. Accordingly, as a matter of fact the firmest lines that we are able to draw are often largely a matter of mental convenience. What M. Compayré says of one class of institu-

tions is true of a vast number of others : "It is necessary, in the first place, to discard the prejudice that the first universities of the Middle Ages were born suddenly, in a day, at a precise moment, whose date it would be possible to fix exactly." This truth the evolutionists have taught us so thoroughly that some historical writers now seem disposed to go too far in disregarding historical periods.

We Americans sometimes divide our own history into three grand divisions, viz. :

The Colonial Period, 1607-1775, marked by our dependence upon England.

The Revolutionary Period, 1775-1789, marked by the struggle for independence and the various attempts to organize our political system.

The Constitutional Period, extending from 1789 to the present day.

It must not be supposed that such divisions as these are like those of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms. A given historic field may be divided, and be well divided, in quite different ways. Much depends upon the judgment of the author or teacher, and upon his immediate purpose. Every one of the periods just given may, for certain purposes, be broken up with advantage. The first one may be divided into the period of discovery, the period of colonization, and the period of colonial life. The second one may be divided into the continental and the confederate periods, March 1, 1781, forming the point of division. The third one may be divided into the period of foreign relations extending to 1820, the period of economic questions to 1845, and the period of the slavery controversy to 1869. Or the periods may be divided with reference to particular facts or questions, as the third one with reference to the ascendancy of political parties.

To recognize the features that characterize the different periods, and so to distinguish them, calls for much knowledge and judgment.

Sometimes the century and period have a general corre-

spondence. The French Revolution is said, in a general way, to mark the close of the last century. Again, a man is described as belonging, by his mental character, to the sixteenth century or to the eighteenth. But, apart from such correspondences, the century is an exceedingly useful scale for the arrangement and retention of historical facts. It is often sufficient for practical purposes to refer an event to its century : as the first Crusade to the close of the eleventh, the discovery of America to the close of the fifteenth, the planting of the first English colonies in America to the beginning of the seventeenth. Besides, some facts, as a war or revolution occupying considerable time, can not be referred to a particular year.

We also classify historical matter with reference to dynasties, reigns, and administrations. The divisions of time that are thus named are sometimes natural and sometimes artificial divisions of history. Some of them are the mere incidents of succession, but others stand for ideas, policies, and great accomplished facts. The Norman dynasty marks the last subjugation of England. We speak of the Elizabethan and the Victorian Ages of English literature. The accession of William III to the throne of England had much significance. In the United States the inauguration of Presidents has sometimes marked new measures, as those of Jefferson, 1801 ; Jackson, 1829 ; and Lincoln, 1861.

But even when it is not thus marked off, as commonly it is not, the administration serves a useful purpose. The leading facts occurring in it can be associated with the President, he with them. The twenty administrations, counting the double administrations as units, may be likened to a cabinet of twenty boxes, or to a bookcase containing an equal number of shelves on which books may be so placed that they can be readily found when wanted. For many of the facts that he requires, the administration is as small a division of time as one needs. The common man is content to know that President Jackson vetoed the Bank Bill, that

President Jefferson was the father of the embargo, that the Oregon question was settled in the time of Polk, and the Northeastern boundary in that of Tyler. Hence, it is one of the duties of the teacher of the elementary history of the United States to teach the pupil his "administrations" thoroughly.

The methods already described will not answer the definite purposes of instruction in history. The teacher must face the questions : How many, and what dates ? and, How to teach them ?

The year will commonly suffice, but not always : 1492 is hardly definite enough for the discovery of America, or 1776 for the Declaration of Independence. The date of John Cabot's landfall, June 24, 1497, is important by reason of its relations to the pretended landfall of Vesputius, June 6, 1497, and the genuine one of Columbus, October 4, 1498. For the rest, years alone will answer for all the voyages of American discovery that need be taught : Ponce de Leon's discovery of Florida, 1512 ; De Soto's expedition, 1539 ; Verrazzano's exploration of the coast, 1524 ; Cartier's voyages to the St. Lawrence region, 1534, 1535, 1540 ; Hudson's visit to the Hudson and the Delaware, 1609, etc.

Since the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock fixes Forefathers' Day, the date should be exactly given, December 22, 1620. But years will do for all the other first settlements. Indeed, the pupil may well congratulate himself if, later in life, he can recall the years of a few of the more prominent ones : Jamestown, 1607 ; New York, 1613 ; Boston, 1630 ; Hartford, 1634 ; Providence, 1635 ; Philadelphia, 1682.

The periods of conflict between the English and the French in North America should be carefully marked off, as follows :

Charles First's War, 1627-1630, in which the English seized Port Royal and Quebec, but only to yield them up again on the conclusion of peace.

King William's War, 1689-1697, marked by several In-

dian forays against the English settlements, and by two unsuccessful attempts to reduce Canada.

Queen Anne's War, 1702-1713, in which the English again captured Port Royal (and retained it thenceforth), and in which they again put forth fruitless efforts to reduce Canada.

King George's War, 1744-1748, famous for the capture of Louisburg and the island of Cape Breton, which, however, were given up to France at the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.

The French and Indian War, 1754-1763, at the close of which France transferred to England her possessions on the continent north of the English colonies and east of the Mississippi, except the small portion of Louisiana east of the river that went to Spain.

In dealing with the military operations and political events falling within these limits, it would be commonly quite sufficient to assign them to their respective periods. A few, however, should be definitely taught: as the seizure of the Forks of the Ohio by the French, 1754; the fall of Quebec, 1759; and the Treaty of Paris, 1763.

In dealing with the War of Independence, the teacher will be somewhat more definite. But even here months and days will, as a rule, either uselessly encumber the memory or be speedily forgotten. April 19, 1775, marking the beginning of the war, and October 10, 1781, marking the surrender of Yorktown, are the most important.

In dealing with military operations that are parts of campaigns, and particularly when the stage is crowded, it is generally best to refer them to these larger movements. With our Civil War, for example, the teacher should make out for his own guidance, or adopt, a scheme of all such operations as may properly be called campaigns, not omitting their time limits and interior relations. It will suffice here to remark, in addition, that a few definite dates must content the pupil and the teacher alike.

Carlyle remarks upon the discrepancy existing between our manner of observing things and their manner of occurring:

The most gifted man can observe, still more record, only the series of his own impressions; his observation, therefore, to say nothing of its other imperfections, must be *successive*, while the things done were often *simultaneous*; the things done were not a series, but a group. It is not in acted as it is in written history: actual events are no wise so simply related to each other as parent and offspring are; every single event is the offspring not of one but of all other events prior or contemporaneous, and will in its turn combine with all others to give birth to new; it is an ever-living, ever-working chaos of being, wherein shape after shape bodies itself forth from innumerable events. . . . All narrative is, by its nature, of only one dimension; only travels forward toward one or toward successive points; narrative is *linear*, action is *solid*.

The difficulty is a real one; it can be overcome but partially, and that only as the result of discipline. Even if he occupies the most eligible place on the whole field, a commanding general can not see all the turns and stages of a battle, although they may lie within the scope of his eyesight; he ranges back and forth, looks first to one part of the field and then to another, sees some things done and some that have been done, uses his ears as well as his eyes, and by the employment of all his faculties—observation, inference, memory, and imagination—constructs a measurably complete view of the battle as a whole. Not unlike this is the position of a student of history who seeks to comprehend the whole action that is taking place on any large historic field. He can see but one thing at a time; his mind moves in column and not in line, and it is only by following a given series a certain distance, and by frequently going back to bring up the parallel series, and by much exercise of his co-ordinating faculties, that he finally comes to see the action, as it were, in group. A master of historical composition even can not drive two, and much less three or four, series of events abreast; and in nothing does he use his skill to better purpose than in choosing halting places for the column that he had pushed on in the van, while he brings up the columns that have fallen into the rear. Thus again we reach a reason

why the child's first lessons in history must be stories chosen with large reference to simplicity of action.

The questions, How many and what dates shall I teach? have continually receded before us. The fact is, no person can definitely answer this question for another, or even for himself, until he is in the presence of his class. The teacher who demands definite answers, or feels the need of them, thereby confesses his unfitness to teach the subject. All that I can say, in addition to what I have said, is to offer a few practical remarks.

1. Too many dates are sometimes taught, and bad judgment is often shown in their selection. Some teachers seem to think that pounding dates into a child's mind is the main thing to be done. In fact, the over-emphasizing of chronology has hitherto been one of the serious defects of history teaching. Accordingly, it can not be too plainly stated that a dictionary of dates is not a history. If the chronologist were a historian, no form of literary composition would be easier, whereas it is a high literary art. Clio sits by right in the circle of the Muses. "To be a really great historian," Lord Macaulay remarks, "is perhaps the rarest of intellectual distinctions."

Dates are not the skeleton of history, as is sometimes said; they are not even its articulations. The American Revolution turns on the battle of Lexington, somewhat as the human arm "turns" on the ball-and-socket joint of the shoulder; the date, April 19, 1775, merely marks the time of the transaction, unless, indeed, it is conceived of as the transaction itself.

2. The opposite mistake is sometimes made. The time when an event occurs is dismissed with the contemptuous remark, "A mere date." Now, while facts are the staple of history, they do not become history until they are properly worked up or organized. It has already been insisted that the teacher must constantly regard those relations that control such organization—time, place, and causation. Furthermore, in the early stage of instruction time should be

more emphasized than the other two principles, or, at all events, than the third one. It is true that time relations, as antecedent and consequent, may be taught irrespective of dates ; still, it will be found that, unless a sufficient number of dates are fixed in the mind to keep facts in their places, they will straggle about in the most vagrant fashion. It is more important to remember this fact, because the doctrine of evolution, which has so much modified methods of studying history, tends to fix attention on the development as a whole, or on the stages into which it is divisible. To a degree this method meets the ends of history, but by no means wholly so. The time when an event occurs is sometimes as important as the event itself ; and in general there can be no useful comparison of historical facts without reference to dates or measurably definite periods of time. It is a fault for a writer to sprinkle his pages too thickly with B. C.'s and A. D.'s ; but to leave the reader in doubt as to the time relations of facts, or to compel him to infer them from the drift of the narrative because the dates are too sparse, is quite as serious a mistake.

It does not follow that a pupil should not learn a date because he does not comprehend its full historical significance or have definite ideas of the distance of the event from the base line or from some other event. Such ability as this is acquired but slowly. The prodigious significance of the great dates of history continually grows upon the minds of veteran scholars.

3. Much depends upon the particular subject with which the teacher is dealing. As in geography we are content with general ideas of distant countries, and especially of large countries, while we require much more definite knowledge in dealing with the near, and especially our own country ; so in history we do not expect, save in special work, the detail in dealing with Grecian or Roman history that we require in English history, and much less in the history of the United States. The purpose of the writer or teacher also has a direct bearing upon the question, whether he is

dealing with the subject in an elementary or a thorough manner.

4. The important dates are the ones to teach—those that stand to the whole historic movement in a relation similar to that of the superior articulations to the human body. These important dates should be fixed in the mind exactly or approximately as firmly as possible, and other dates be arranged with reference to them as antecedent or consequent. It is not so important to know the day on which the second Continental Congress convened or adjourned as it is to know the day that it assigned to the United States a separate position among the nations of the world.

5. the age of pupils, their advancement in study and particularly in history, and the time that is to be given to the subject, are all to be considered. Here, however, the criteria already laid down for the selection of historical facts in general apply in full force.

Nothing but a knowledge of the subject taught, and of the conditions attending the pupils or the class, and good judgment, will enable the teacher to decide how many and what dates to teach. The attempt has been made to present the principal considerations that bear on the two questions, and to illustrate some methods of procedure. The competent teacher can desire nothing more. The Germans, or some of them, do indeed go further. In the Berlin course of study sixty-three dates are required to be taught in the second class of the elementary schools, and fifty-three in the first class ; one hundred and sixteen in all, or about six new dates a month.

6. Still another suggestion may prove useful. The history of one country may serve as a general chronological guide for the history of others. Thus, after she assumed a leading position in the Mediterranean, Rome should be made the point of observation from which to survey the history of that whole basin. "What was going on in Carthage at the time when Pyrrhus invaded Italy?" "in Greece in the days of the Second Punic War?" "in the East in the days

of Pompey or Julius Cæsar?" For the general American student, England should be the standard for Europe, at least after the Norman Conquest. "Who ruled in France in the time of Richard the Lion-hearted?" "What was the state of Prussia in the early part of the reign of George III?"

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PLACE RELATION : GEOGRAPHY.

References.—See Chapter X.

SINCE history is action or movement, it involves the idea of place as well as of time. An action or event, as the very phrase suggests, must take place somewhere as well as sometime. In purely subjective history neither element is prominent, and both may be practically left out of the account. Dealing with a man's thought or feeling merely, we do not pay much attention to the time when or to the place where he carried it on. But when thought becomes will and will expresses itself in action—that is, the very moment that history becomes objective—the two elements distinctly appear. Hence geography is the second of the two eyes of history.

The historical bearings or relations of geography may be considered under two aspects, the static and the dynamic. First, geography furnishes history its sphere or theater of action. This is a purely spatial relation. Thus considered, it has nothing to do with producing or modifying the action ; it merely provides the ground where historic forces act and bring about their results. But, secondly, geography is a historical cause of great potency and value. Temperature, humidity, and food directly affect a man's physical and mental character, and so his life. Heat and cold, wet and dry, a diet of rice and a diet of train oil, are immediate historical factors. Still further, these agents also affect him through his occupations, his pastimes, his activities, and his wants still more powerfully, and so are mediate historical factors of great value. The historian must take account of

food supply, the occupations of men, industries, and commerce, all closely related to natural conditions. He must account for the location, the growth, and the character of cities, and the construction of lines of transportation and travel. What powerful factors in American history are Indian corn, the cotton belt, the fisheries, the forests and coal fields, the oil regions, and the gold and silver mines ! Military operations, it is almost unnecessary to remark, are largely governed by physical conditions. Gettysburg gave the National and Confederate armies a field of battle ; by its relations and peculiar conformation this field exerted a great influence upon the battle itself. The shores of Massachusetts Bay gave the Puritans an opportunity to do something ; they also determined to a degree what they did and what they could do. These two aspects of geography are never practically separated ; neither one is ever wanting in real history ; but the causal element, as we shall see hereafter, is a variable quantity.

Since the two aspects are always practically united, some might think it better to consider them together in such a discussion as the present one. However, there are certain advantages that attend handling them separately. Accordingly, I shall treat the purely place relation in the present chapter, leaving physical environment to be considered more fully hereafter.

Life gives to matter its highest value, and wherever universal death prevails the interest of the mind can not be permanently maintained. If the moon be what we are assured it is, even an astronomer, could he visit it, would wander over its surface much as we walk over a bed of cinders or a field of lava. The earth is most interesting when considered in relation to its human uses. Geography provides man his sphere of life, and then finds its highest interest, not in its deserts or crags, its glaciers or cañons, but in its human elements. Political geography is nothing but a form of applied history. Then the two elements together make up the interest of travel. To assign to the physical

elements and historical elements of a country or locality their relative degrees of value would be impossible, especially as the ratio would not be the same with all persons ; similarly we can not nicely separate between current and historical life ; but there is little doubt that the majority of men attribute more or less interest to Nature that properly belongs to humanity, and also some interest to contemporary life that belongs to past time. Men toil and suffer to visit countries and places having little living interest. The Holy Places attract pilgrims because they have been made holy by devoted and self-denying lives. Moses is greater than Mount Sinai, Abraham than Palestine, Jesus than the Lake of Galilee. It is very true that back of the event lie causes, thoughts, feelings, and activities ; but there is a certain tendency to look for them, and also the event itself, in the locality.

There are still other reasons for emphasizing geography in connection with history. Historical events that are not located by the pupil are neither understood nor remembered. History that is read without due attention to its theater is too much like an imaginary account of similar transactions in the moon. Hence, the teacher must bring the pupil's history down out of the clouds and rest it on the ground and in the water. Thomas Carlyle once wrote to one of his nephews :

As to subjects for reading, I recommend in general all kinds of books that will give you real information about men, their works and ways, past and present. History is evidently the grand subject a student will take to. Never read any such book without a map beside you ; endeavor to seek out every place the author names, and get a clear idea of the ground you are on ; without this you can never understand him, much less remember him. Mark the dates of the chief events and epochs ; write them ; get them fixed into your memory—chronology and geography are the two lamps of history.

Careful study of a good map is the next best thing to visiting a historical locality in person. To a certain ex-

tent geography and history are but one study ; and the effort now made in schools to study them in close connection is worthy of all praise. Thus the memory is wholly dependent upon the associating activities of the mind. Without them nothing could be retained and nothing could be learned. Besides, contiguity of space is one of the most powerful of these activities. In view of these facts we need not enlarge upon the importance of the place element in history.

The student of history might adopt a method similar to that of the chronologist: he might use the geographical divisions of a country or state as a cabinet of boxes for the distribution of his facts. If the theater under consideration is small, something quite like this must be done ; but generally a less artificial method is to be preferred.

When an important fact belongs to a notable place, the association is effected without difficulty. The Declaration of Independence and the Federal Convention of 1787 easily attach themselves to Philadelphia. If the event is less important or the place is less notable, the association is not so easy. In fact, properly to connect events and places is by no means the least part of the student's task. However, to associate each fact that should be remembered with its own definite locality is much like associating it with its own definite year, the folly of which was commented upon in the last chapter. We may borrow a useful hint from that discussion : we may throw our facts to districts of country, to cities or towns, or to marked natural features, much as we before threw them to periods of time.

For example, the subject of study is the Mexican War. Before taking this up as a series of military operations, it should be viewed in its causes and general conditions. The following factors should be mentioned : the geographical relations of Mexico and the United States previous to the war—their long and irregular boundary, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean ; the disputed strip of territory lying between the river Nueces and the Rio Grande,

a dispute that grew out of the Texas annexation ; the possession by Mexico of the vast region now comprising California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming, none of it thickly populated and most of it waste and uncultivated, none of it known to contain metals, but much of it fertile and productive; the California coast and San Francisco Bay—the eagerness of the American statesmen who were then in the ascendant, and of a large share of the people, particularly at the South, to gain a Southwestern accession of territory and to widen the front of the republic opening upon the western ocean, as well as their determination to maintain the national claim to the left bank of the Rio Grande. All these factors should be duly emphasized, and particularly the enlarging and aggressive habit of the American people. “Indemnity for the past and security for the future” was a favorite battle-cry from the beginning of the struggle. These factors being duly recognized, it will be readily seen that the military events fall into four main series:

I. *The Rio Grande Frontier*.—In the spring of 1846 General Taylor fought and won the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, and drove the Mexicans from the east side of the river. Later he invaded Mexico, winning important victories at Monterey and Buena Vista. The pupil should locate all these actions and mark their relations; but if he can permanently associate them with the Rio Grande, placing them on their appropriate sides of the river, nothing more need be desired.

II. *California*.—At the beginning of the war there was an American squadron on the Pacific coast, and also an armed exploring expedition. In the course of the summer of 1846 this squadron, successively commanded by Commodores Sloat and Stockton, and the explorers under Colonel Fremont, seized the principal towns of Upper California and reduced the whole province under American control. In general it will be sufficient to assign the several small engagements that took place simply to California.

III. *New Mexico*.—The same summer General S. W. Kearney marched from the Missouri River across the plains by the old Santa Fé trail, and subjugated all New Mexico without fighting a battle. Kearney then departed for California, but Colonel Doniphan, who was left in command, marched south into Mexico, capturing the city of Chihuahua and the country adjacent. He did not, however, accomplish his purpose of effecting a junction with General Taylor at Monterey.

These successes placed the Americans in possession of the territory that they coveted and that they were determined to hold. From this time on the war was waged on their part to compel the Mexicans to consent to peace on that condition. In fact, the victories of Monterey and Buena Vista were a part of this later policy. Our Government was determined that the left bank of the Rio Grande and San Francisco Bay should never return to their old owners.

IV. *General Scott's Campaign against the City of Mexico*.—In this campaign Vera Cruz was the first objective point, because it was the key to the most direct road leading from the Gulf of Mexico to the Mexican capital. This city, together with the fortress of San Juan de Ulloa, fell before a combined naval and military attack in March, 1847, and soon after the advance upon the capital began. Cerro Gordo was won in April, and the campaign culminated in the Valley of Mexico in August and September. As before, the student should follow the army map in hand; but it will suffice for him permanently to associate Cerro Gordo with Vera Cruz, and all the operations in the Valley with the Capital City.

In many cases all practical purposes will be answered by associating events with some city or town, or feature of country, even although considerable distance intervene. Further on a chapter will be given to the Revolutionary War; but here it may be pointed out that all the important events of that struggle may be referred to a few centers, to

be grouped and associated. These centers, or, at all events, the most important of them, are Boston, Long Island Sound, Lake Champlain, Montreal, Quebec, Saratoga, New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, Savannah, and the waters of Virginia. Or if it be thought that this is giving too much latitude, then New Jersey and North and South Carolina may be added. West of the mountains, East Tennessee and the Illinois and Wabash country should not be overlooked. With Boston may be associated Lexington and Concord, the beleaguer of the city, Bunker Hill, the assumption of command by Washington, the fortification of Dorchester Heights, and the evacuation of the city. With Philadelphia may be associated the early Congresses, the Declaration of Independence, Trenton, Princeton, Brandywine, the occupation of the city by General Howe, Germantown, Valley Forge, and the evacuation of the city by the British. Such groupings can be worked out with more or less detail as circumstances may determine, and may be rendered the more effective by writing them out upon the blackboard and having them copied into notebooks.

That geographical facts are much better understood, and much more readily retained by the mind, when grouped and clothed with a human interest—that the same is true of historical facts when grouped and rested on their geographical supports—are commonplaces. Full play for the invention of the teacher is given in the effort to group and associate the facts.

The system of waters to which we are admitted by the strait between Cape Charles and Cape Henry is one of the most interesting, both geographically and historically, in our whole country. These waters have been the theater of important and interesting events in the three great epochs of our history: Discovery and Colonization, the Revolution, and the Civil War. One or two places and three or four characters become at once centers around which all the historical facts that need be taught can be grouped. First, we

have Jamestown, Captain John Smith, Powhatan, and Pocahontas; secondly, Yorktown, Washington, Rochambeau, and Cornwallis; thirdly, Washington and Richmond, Lincoln, Grant, Davis, and Lee.

The history of Lakes George and Champlain and the river Richelieu presents three or four interesting groups of facts. Champlain, the Father of Canada, appeared on the shore of the lake bearing his name, surrounded by the wildness of Nature, in the year 1609. In the middle of the last century these waters and their shores were a main theater of the French and Indian War. There rise up before us Fort William Henry, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, and the wilderness fortresses of less degree; the battlefields of Lake George, William Henry, and Ticonderoga; the figures of Montcalm, Abercrombie, Lord Howe, and Amherst. Twenty years later came the army sent from Canada to separate the New England States from the other States. Now we catch a view of the fields of Bennington, Stillwater, and Saratoga; of Burgoyne and Gates, Schuyler, Stark, and Arnold. Thirty-seven years later, in the last year of the War of 1812, came Provost and Downie, attempting, like Burgoyne, to split the Union, and, like him, failing in their purpose.

Then, the Delaware will always be associated with great events: as Penn's treaty with the Indians, the Continental Congress, the British occupation, and the Federal Convention; and with great characters, as Penn, Dr. Franklin, and Washington.

Groupings of historical figures and scenes around geographical centers make these centers instinct with life and motion; while the centers themselves, binding the figures and scenes together, give them a new permanence and solidity. The teacher will find it an excellent exercise to group a series of essays around one of these centers—excellent for the purposes of language as well as of geography and history. Suppose we take for illustration the Champlain Valley. One essay will do for Champlain and the discovery of the lake; a dozen can be assigned to the men and the

events of the French and Indian War; the same number to the Revolution. The whole can be called "Lake Champlain in History." Of course, not many centers of historical activity can be treated in so thorough a way; some can be; while the pupil will carry the method and the habit of mind thus created to other facts and to other subjects.

CHAPTER IX.

CAUSE AND EFFECT IN HISTORY.

References.—Flint: The Philosophy of History in France and Germany (the Introduction contains a good general account of the development of the idea); Bunsen: Outlines of the Philosophy of History (compendious General Introduction); Montesquieu: The Spirit of Laws; Buckle: The History of Civilization in England (Vol. I., Chap. I.); Draper: The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe, I.; Guizot: History of Civilization; Lecky: The Political Value of History; Froude: Short Studies of Great Subjects (I., Is History a Science? II., Scientific Method applied to History), The Educational Review, V., (Inaugural Lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford); Goldwin Smith: Lectures on the Study of History (I., An Inaugural Lecture, II., III., On the Study of History, IV., On Some Proposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress, V., The Moral Freedom of Man); Lavisse: General View of the Political History of Europe; Dabney: Papers of the American Historical Association, V., No. III. (Is History a Science?) Harris: id., V., No. III. (The Philosophical Aspect of History).

THE Greek thinkers made two kinds of knowledge, empirical and philosophical—knowledge of phenomena and knowledge of causes. They also called these two forms of knowledge the knowledge *that* and the knowledge *why*. Perhaps it is needless to say that the second is much the higher kind of knowledge; we do not fully know a thing until we can explain it or account for it. Furthermore, the mind refuses to be satisfied with mere facts; it asks *Why?* and *Wherefore?* as well as *What?* and does not rest until it has discovered the reason and the law of things.

Savages, while differing from civilized men in the methods that they use and in the results that they reach, still deal with causes. They think themselves surrounded by occult influences and mysterious powers.

In the midst of Nature [it has been said] the Indian knew nothing of her laws. His perpetual reference of her phenomena to occult agencies forestalled inquiry and precluded inductive reasoning. If the wind blew with violence, it was because the water-lizard, which makes the wind, had crawled out of his pool; if the lightning was sharp and frequent, it was because the young of the thunder-bird were restless in their nest; if a blight fell upon the corn, it was because the Corn Spirit was angry; and if the beavers were shy and difficult to catch, it was because they had taken offense at seeing the bones of one of their race thrown to a dog.*

At the opposite pole of thought are the conceptions of unity, law, and order which constitute the core of modern science and philosophy.

The advance from the stage of savage thought to the stage of scientific thought, as respects the physical world, and still more as respects the moral world, cost man a prodigious effort; in fact, the conceptions of law, order, and unity are not yet as firmly fixed in the second as they are in the first. Spiritual phenomena are more elusive and less easy to grasp; while we are here called upon to deal with one of the hardest questions of philosophy, viz., the adjustment of man's free will to universal causation, a question that happily falls outside the limits of the present discussion.

The notions of historical uniformity and progress were but feebly and vaguely discerned in antiquity. In his *General History* Polybius rose to the conception of the universal, as his title shows. The problem that he set for himself to solve was "how, in the short space of fifty-three years, all the known parts of the earth were reduced beneath the

* Parkman: *The Jesuits in North America*, lxxxviii.

power of a single state. . . . The most useful part of history," he wrote, "is the knowledge of what passed before and after every great event, and especially of the causes that produced it. . . . It is not possible to obtain an entire view and knowledge of the whole of things from particular history." Christianity was based upon the ideas of the spiritual unity of the whole race and of a providential plan, and so prepared the way for juster views of the scope of history. The Middle Ages, so far from advancing the philosophy of history, rather introduced new and hard elements into the main problem. Froissart, the author of the pictured page of chivalry, caught a glimmer of the larger bearings of things. "If I were merely to say such and such things happened at such and such times," he wrote, "without entering fully into the matter, which was grandly horrible and disastrous, this would be a chronicle, but no history." Pascal, in the seventeenth century, worked out his celebrated analogy of the race to the individual :

The whole succession of human beings throughout the whole course of ages must be regarded as a single individual man, continually living and continually learning ; and that shows how unwarranted is the deference we yield to the philosophers of antiquity ; for, as old age is that which is most distant from infancy, it must be manifest to all that old age in the universal man should not be sought in the times near his birth, but in the times most distant from it. Those whom we call the ancients are really those who lived in the youth of the world and the true infancy of man ; and as we have added the experience of the ages between us and them to what they knew, it is only in ourselves that is to be found that antiquity which we venerate in others.

At the middle of the last century Montesquieu wrote his epoch-making book *The Spirit of Laws*, in which he strongly set forth the doctrine of human progress through the operation of general causes. His philosophy of history has been summed up by a competent hand in the statement that "the course of history is, on the whole, determined by general causes, by widespread and persistent tendencies, by

broad and deep undercurrents, and only influenced in a feeble, secondary, and subordinate degree by single events, by definite arguments, by particular enactments, by anything incidental, isolated, or individual.”* Turgot, philosopher and statesman, was the author of the saying so often quoted in connection with the American Revolution, “Colonies are like fruits, which cling to the tree only until they ripen.” However, Herder, who wrote near the close of the last century, is commonly accounted the real founder of the philosophy of history.†

By short steps and slow, philosophical ideas have been introduced into the field of historical research. Educated men now accept the fact of a grand moral order ; or, in other words, they recognize the sway of law over the thoughts, feelings, and actions of men, and so over history. Tennyson expresses the optimistic phase of this view in the familiar lines :

Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the
suns.

There is, indeed, a serious dispute over the question how

* Flint: The Philosophy of History, London, 1874, p. 105. I am indebted to this writer for several references and quotations.

† “ Whenever we speak of society as an *organism*, whenever we conceive of languages, customs, laws, institutions, arts, literatures, and religions as *organic growths*, whenever we regard the whole life of man—intellectual, moral, and physical—as a *gradual development*, we are adopting a mode of thought of which our race had no inkling before the last third of the eighteenth century, and which was first proclaimed in the immortal Fragments of the youthful Herder. ‘This, to be sure, is a madman or a genius!’ exclaimed Wieland. ‘He is at any rate the only one for whom it is worth *my* while to publish my ideas,’ said Lessing. Now the message with which this youthful prodigy electrified his contemporaries is the German contribution to human thought, and animating principle of its movements from that day to this. It consists in the substitution of *fieri* for *facere*—of spontaneous evolution for intentional institution—as leading conception in the study and interpretation of human society and human civilization.”—DR. J. G. SCHURMAN.

far scientific ideas can be extended in history. Some writers regard historical facts as so fixed and certain, and the laws of historical development so definite, as to justify them in calling history a science ; others insist that this is going too far, some even denying that there is such a thing as the philosophy of history. To a considerable extent this controversy is about words and names, and not about facts ; at least, the writers who deny that there is a science or even a philosophy of history, as well as those who affirm the reality of one or the other, hold stoutly to historical causation. Even Mr. Froude, who regards history merely as a drama, admits that it does teach that right and wrong are true distinctions.

It is in the doctrine of causation that we find the value of history as a guide and a discipline. Rightly led, the student does not struggle with a mass of disconnected and meaningless facts, but pursues his work under the guiding principles of unity and order. The conduct is shaped and the intellect disciplined by grasping the fact that like events follow like causes. The pupil learns the law that whatever a man or a nation sows, that must be reaped, which is the very beginning of historical wisdom. He sees the consequences of freedom, of slavery, of war, of tyranny and oppression, of national prodigality and wastefulness. He learns that there is no universally best form of government, but that the form which is best in a given case depends upon the history and the genius of the people, and that that is best relatively which best expresses the national life. He does not learn to accept the lines—

For forms of government let fools contest ;
Whate'er is best administered is best ;

or the lines—

How small, of all that human hearts endure,
That part which kings or laws can cause or cure ;

but he does learn that the springs of human well-being, both

individual and national, lie deep in the character, history, and environment of men. He learns that political institutions are the results of general causes, and that they grow, and are not merely made. He learns that a republican government like our own is closely dependent upon a high stage of intelligence and virtue. He sees that a nation's civilization is characterized by a certain unity ; that education, morals, politics, and social life are not distinct and separate phenomena, but are closely related. More than this, he discovers that nations are dependent upon one another ; that no one country has totally separate interests, but that the good of one and the good of all are more or less closely bound up together.

He learns the facts so well stated by Mr. Lecky relative to the great permanent forces that are steadily bearing nations onward to improvement or decay :

The strongest of these forces are the moral ones. Mistakes in statesmanship, military triumphs or disasters, no doubt affect materially the prosperity of nations, but their permanent political well-being is essentially the outcome of their moral state. Its foundation is laid in pure domestic life, in commercial integrity, in a high standard of moral worth and of public spirit, in simple habits, in courage, uprightness, and self-sacrifice, in a certain soundness and moderation of judgment, which springs quite as much from character as from intellect. If you would form a wise judgment of the future of a nation, observe carefully whether these qualities are increasing or decaying. Observe especially what qualities count for most in public life. Is character becoming of greater, or less, importance? Are the men who obtain the highest posts in the nation men of whom in private life and irrespective of party competent judges speak with genuine respect? Are they men of sincere convictions, sound judgment, consistent lives, indisputable integrity? or are they men who have won their positions by the arts of a demagogue or an intriguer; men of nimble tongues and not earnest beliefs—skillful, above all things, in spreading their sails to each passing breeze of popularity? Such considerations as these are apt to be forgotten in the fierce excitement of a party contest; but if history has any meaning, it is such considerations that affect most vitally

the permanent well-being of communities, and it is by observing this moral current that you can best cast the horoscope of a nation.

This is not an inappropriate place to point another lesson of history, one presented by Lord Bacon in his essay *On Innovations*. These, he truly tells us, are "the births of time." "Time," he says, "is the greatest innovator." Also: "It were good, therefore, that men in their innovations would follow the example of Time itself; which indeed innovateth greatly, but quietly and by degrees scarce to be perceived." This is the lesson of patience and of watchfulness. It by no means follows that certain causes will not produce good results because they do not appear at once, or that other causes will not produce evil results because they do not immediately declare themselves. "The movements of Providence," says Guizot, "are not restricted to narrow bounds; it is not anxious to deduce to-day the consequence of the premises it laid down yesterday. It may defer this for ages, till the fullness of time shall come. Its logic will not be less conclusive for reasoning slowly. Providence moves through time, as the gods of Homer through space—it makes a step, and ages have rolled away."

In a word, our student becomes familiar with some of the many valuable lessons of history, for it is impossible to pursue intelligently the facts without getting something of their meaning. He finds also, to quote Mr. Lecky again, that history "is one of the best schools for that kind of reasoning which is most useful in practical life. It teaches men to weigh conflicting probabilities, to estimate degrees of evidence, to form a sound judgment on the value of authorities. . . . History is largely concerned with the kind of probability on which the conduct of life depends."

Accident, or what Frederick the Great called "King Hazard," has played an important part in history. Mr. Lecky's question in regard to Mohammed, Charles Martel, and Washington and Napoleon is quoted in another place. The same writer affirms that the course of European history would

have been very different if Hannibal had taken and destroyed Rome after Cannæ, or if France, instead of the Regency and the two succeeding Louises had been under such sovereigns as those of the elder house of Orange, or the Great Elector, or Frederick the Great. We can not even imagine in what channels history would have run if Oliver Cromwell had fallen at Edgehill instead of John Hampden, Wallenstein at Lützen instead of Gustavus Adolphus, or Napoleon at Marengo instead of Desaix. The part that caprice plays in history is at once serious and amusing. After observing that love, the cause of which is an "I know not what," moves princes, armies, the entire world, Pascal adds : "If the nose of Cleopatra had been shorter, the whole face of the earth would have been changed" ; and Mr. Green, remarking upon the "equable serenity" with which the Duke of Marlborough met the "pettiness of the German princes, the phlegm of the Dutch, the ignorant opposition of his officers, the libels of his political opponents," says : "There was a touch of irony in the simple expedients by which he sometimes solved problems which had baffled cabinets. The King of Prussia was one of the most vexatious of the allies, but all difficulty with him ceased when Marlborough rose at a state banquet and handed him a napkin."

Some words of caution must be added. The writer or the teacher of history should not use his theme as a vehicle for conveying favorite ideas or doctrines. It is not his main duty to teach moral lessons directly or to explain social or political philosophy. On the other hand, he is to tell his story as it was—as Carlyle puts it, "he is to come at some picture of the thing acted." What happened? is his first question, truthful narration his first duty. Bacon wrote, in the *Advancement of Learning* : "It is the true office of history to represent the events themselves, and to leave the observations and conclusions thereof to the liberty and faculty of every man's judgment." Causes, reasons, and theories must in no case be put in front of the facts. Moreover, the

logical faculty may be employed with altogether too much freedom. These significant sentences come to us from that profound historical scholar, Guizot :

It must not, however, be supposed that a bad principle radically vitiates an institution, nor even that it does it all the mischief of which it is pregnant. Nothing tortures history more than logic. No sooner does the human mind seize upon an idea, than it draws from it all its possible consequences, makes it produce in imagination, all that it would in reality be capable of producing, and then figures it down in history with all the extravagant additions which itself has conjured up. This, however, is nothing like the truth. Events are not so prompt in their consequences as the human mind in its deductions.

Let it be once admitted that the main function of the historian or teacher is to inculcate moral, political, or religious lessons, and no one can tell what distortion of facts would follow. The historian can not be too full of reverence for what Carlyle called the "verities."

The caution must be made still stronger in the case of elementary history. Here the influence of the teacher may be peculiarly warping, as the pupil is little more than wax in his hands. Besides, at this stage of progress the main thing in hand is to amass materials that may be worked up afterward.

Once more, the philosophy should be incidental rather than obtrusive ; it should follow the examples. A tale well told points its own moral and adorns itself. History is useful as a guide only when it is truly narrated. Its very first moral lesson is to teach the truth. Accordingly, the teacher, to adopt another's words, "should have the genuine historical instinct, the true enthusiasm to know what happened ; he should be fond of the story for its own sake, and be in love with things not merely for what they were, but simply because they were."

CHAPTER X.

PHYSICAL CAUSES THAT ACT IN HISTORY.

References.—Reclus: The Earth and its Inhabitants, with Numerous Illustrations and Maps (Europe 5 vols., Asia 4 vols., Africa 4 vols., Oceanica 1 vol., North and South America 4 vols. The last four volumes are entitled, British North America; Mexico, Central America, and the West Indies; The United States, and South America), The Earth, a Descriptive History of the Phenomena of the Life of the Globe, The Ocean, Atmosphere, and Life, being the Second Series of a Descriptive History of the Life of the Globe; Guyot: Earth and Man; Montesquieu: The Spirit of Laws (Books XIV.-XVIII.); Buckle and Draper: titles before given (*passim*); Bryce: The Contemporary Review, XLIX. (History and Geography); Mackinder: Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, IX., New Series (On the Scope and Methods of Geography); Freeman: Historical Geography of Europe (Introduction); Curtius: History of Greece (Book the First, I., Land and People); Thirlwall: History of Greece (I., Geographical Outlines of Greece); Dr. W. Smith: A History of Greece (Introduction); Lanciani: Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries (II., The Foundation and Prehistoric Life of Rome); Goldwin Smith: Lectures and Essays (The Greatness of the Romans, The Greatness of England. These essays, first published in The Contemporary Review, are excellent); Taine: History of English Literature (Introduction), Art in Greece; Green: A Short History of England, The Making of England, A Short Geography of the British Islands; Huxley: Physiography; Mill: The Realm of Nature, An Outline of Physiography (XVII., Man in Nature); Shaler: Introduction to the Narrative and Critical History of America, IV. (Physiography of North America), Nature and Man in America (both excellent); Burgess: Political Science and Constitutional Law (Book I., Chap. II., The Present Geographical Distribution of Nations and Nationalities, III., National Political

Character, IV., Conclusions of Practical Politics from the Foregoing Considerations in regard to Physical, Ethnical, and Political Geography, and National Characteristics); Mahan: The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783, The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1793-1812. (A distinguished foreign critic has called the author of these works the creator of the philosophy of naval history.)

THE reciprocal influence of Man and Nature is one of the hard subjects with which modern scientists and philosophers are called upon to deal. The action of Nature and the reaction of man, or, as some might prefer to state it, the action of man and the reaction of Nature, are the questions that it presents for answer. While it is not necessary that the teacher of history should deal with these questions on their speculative side, it is necessary for him to recognize the principal physical factors.

Naturally, the first of these factors to attract attention was climate, the influence of which on the character and history of nations was recognized by the Greek thinkers. This recognition is well illustrated by the passage, hereafter quoted, in which Aristotle points out the contrast between Asia and Europe. However, the Greek writers never worked out the subject.

Bodin, who died in 1569, was apparently the first modern writer to investigate the historical influence of physical causes, as well as the first to vindicate the claim of all religious confessions in a state to equal political toleration. Dividing nations into northern, middle, and southern, he investigated with much fullness of knowledge how climate and other geographical conditions affect the bodily strength, the courage, the intelligence, the humanity, the chastity, and, in short, the mind, morals, and manners of peoples; what influence mountains, winds, diversities of soil, etc., exert; and elicited a great number of general views, some of which are false, but some also true.*

* Flint: History of Philosophy, p. 74.

In the *Spirit of Laws*, published in 1748, Montesquieu sought to explain how laws are related to manners, climates, creeds, and forms of government. He laid great stress on the physical factors in civilization, and is sometimes said to have originated the doctrine of climates. Five of his books bear titles that indicate, in a general way, the range of his inquiries: *Of Laws as relative to the Nature of Climate*; *In what manner the Laws of Civil Slavery are relative to the Nature of the Climate*; *How the Laws of Domestic Slavery have a Relation to the Nature of the Climate*; *How the Laws of Political Servitude have a Relation to the Nature of the Climate*; *Of Laws in the Relation that they bear to the Nature of the Soil*. Although he trenches upon the practical denial of the freedom of man, he still checks himself, arguing that laws also bear a relation to the principles which form the general spirit of the morals and customs of a nation—that is, the principles of human nature.

This leads to the observation that here we meet two divergent lines of thought. The question at issue is the adjustment of the material and the spiritual elements of history. In general, it may be said that students of physical science, and others who have formed similar habits of thought, dealing mainly with Nature, are led to emphasize the material element; while philosophers and metaphysicians, dealing mainly with the mind, tend to emphasize the spiritual element.

Mr. Buckle pushed the naturalistic theory to its farthest limit. He denied all freedom to man, and made climate, food, soil, and the general aspects of Nature the supreme and ultimate historical causes. For example, he attributed the superstition of Italy, Spain, and Portugal to earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, and the Calvinistic theology of Scotland to the rocks and mountains of the country and the surrounding ocean waste.*

Dr. J. W. Draper wrote his *History of the Intellectual*

* *History of Civilization in England*, vol. i, p. 29, 88, 89; vol. ii, p. 126.

Development of Europe, Civil Polity in America, and History of the Civil Law, on a naturalistic theory.

M. Taine laid great stress upon soil; sky, sea, climate, and food as factors in the intellectual and literary history of England ; in fact, he wrote his History of English Literature on what he called scientific lines. This distinguished writer was accustomed to refer historical results to race, environment, and the time.

The distinguished scholar and diplomatist, Mr. George P. Marsh, handled the subject in his *Man and Nature*, now better known under the title, *The Earth as modified by Human Action*. He undertook to "indicate the character and extent of the changes produced by human actions in the physical conditions of the globe, to point out the dangers of undue interference with the spontaneous arrangements of the organic or inorganic world, to suggest the possibility and importance of the restoration of harmonies that have been disturbed, and incidentally to illustrate the doctrine that man is, in both kind and degree, a power of a higher order than any of the other forms of animated life, which, like him, are nourished at the table of bounteous Nature." Without discussing his subject in its speculative bearings, Mr. Marsh accumulates a mass of most interesting facts showing that man can waste and repair Nature, and that he is rather her master than her slave.

It is very easy to exaggerate the value of either the human or the natural factor in history, and very hard to assign to either its just and appropriate influence. The fact is, neither one is a constant quantity ; both vary with country, race, and time.

The general subject has not been introduced for discussion on its speculative side, but merely to pave the way for some examples of physical causation. First, however, it should be observed that Nature exerts upon man two kinds of influence. How far climate, food, soil, and the general aspects of Nature affect his mind and character directly, we have no means of determining ; but it is obvious that the

direct effect of such agents is much less than the indirect effect. Through the social wants and activities that they create and modify, through man's occupations and pleasures, through his general habits, they exert upon him a profound influence from his cradle to his grave. The sum total of such influence is known as environment.

Professor Bryce, discussing with much learning and acuteness the relations of history and geography, divided the general subject of environment into three groups of factors, all closely related :

I. The influences that are due to the configuration of the earth's surface—that is to say, to the distribution of land and sea, the arrangement of mountain chains, table-lands, and valleys, the existence of rivers, and the basins which they drain. Nothing can be more evident than that these facts almost wholly controlled the early movement of races, such as migration, and that they powerfully affect military operations, the character and extent of conquests, the size and the boundaries of states, the location and character of cities, the direction, kind, and abundance of facilities for travel and transportation, the presence or absence of harbors, and maritime commerce, growth of military and naval power, the development of special industries, and many other things of the greatest interest.

Dr. Draper remarks that Europe is geographically a peninsula, and historically a dependency of Asia. The plains of Central and Northern Asia are prolonged through Central Europe to the German Ocean and the Baltic ; the average height of the larger continent is 1,132 feet above the level of the sea, of the smaller one 671 feet ; from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean, north of the great central east-and-west mountain axis, a distance of more than 6,000 miles, an army could march without having to encounter any elevation of more than a few hundred feet ; with an abundance of springs and head waters, but without any stream capable of offering a serious obstacle, this tract has a temperature well suited to

military operations ; it coincides practically with the annual isothermal line of fifty degrees, keeping just north of the limit of vine production—in which physical facts Dr. Draper finds the reasons why the Oriental hordes have again and again poured themselves over Europe.

The Spanish Peninsula has a marked geographical character, as any one who will look at its mountain and river systems, its plains and forests on a map, can see ; and this character has given a marked individuality to Spanish warfare from the earliest times, as well as influenced its history in many other important ways. Spain is a hard country to subdue, an easy one to defend—as witness its history in the days of Hannibal, of Sertorius, and of Napoleon and Wellington. Perhaps no book of history was ever written that better illustrates the influence of geography and topography upon the conduct of war than Napier's History of the War in the Peninsula and the South of France. Guerrilla warfare, it is worth observing, found its name, if indeed it did not originate, in Spain. The name dates from the great contest just mentioned. "The term *guerrilla*," says Dr. Lieber, "is the diminutive of the Spanish word *guerra*, and means petty war—that is, war carried on by detached parties, generally in the mountains"—a kind of war to which the country is especially adapted.

The position and configuration of England, her insular character and relations to the continent, the distribution of her river valleys and uplands, and the relations of these features to one another and to the seashore, have had a prodigious influence upon English history and character. How potent these natural factors were in the German conquest of the island, Mr. Green has admirably shown in his Short History of England, and still more fully in his Making of England. Mr. Mackinder well observes that the second of these books is largely "a deduction from geographical conditions of what must have been the course of history." It may be remarked that if the study of English history could be accompanied by the study of such a book as Mr.

and Mrs. Green's Short Geography of the British Islands, it would be a very great advantage.

II. The influences which belong to meteorology and climate, meaning thereby the conditions of heat and cold under which a race of men develops itself with the amount of rain and the recurrence of drought. The winds also play their part. These agents directly affect man's health, strength, and mental character; while indirectly, through soil and fertility, with which they are so closely connected, they almost wholly control his occupations. It is no accident that great peoples and states have never appeared beyond the polar circles or within the tropics, or that the main historical movement has been confined to the north temperate zone. The Greek genius was largely indebted to the physical influences under which it was developed. "Mild and clement is our atmosphere," says Euripides; "the cold of winter is for us without rigor, and the arrows of Phœbus do not wound us."

A people formed by such a climate [says M. Taine, to whom I am indebted for the quotation] develops faster and more harmoniously than any other; man is neither prostrated nor enervated by excessive heat, nor chilled or indurated by severe cold. He is neither condemned to dreamy inactivity nor to perpetual labor; he does not lag behind in mystic contemplation nor in brutal barbarism. Compare a Neapolitan or a Provençal with a man of Brittany, a Hollander, or a Hindoo, and you will recognize how the mildness and moderation of physical nature endow the soul with vivacity, and so balance it as to lead the mind thus disposed and alert to thought and to action.

Thucydides observed that thought was the only peculiarity of the Athenians.

III. The third class of elements that make up environment are the productions which a country offers to human industry. Here we inventory mines, quarries, the products of wells and springs, field and forest, fisheries of all kinds, and animals both wild and domesticated. Professor Bryce

illustrates how a narrow range of productions fatally restricts progress in the arts and refinements of life, by instancing Iceland. The race is of admirable quality, but the country produces nothing save a few sheep and horses, and some sulphur; it has not even fuel, except such driftwood as is cast upon its shores. He adds that if the highest European races were placed in Central or Northern Asia they would find it almost impossible to develop a high type of civilization for want as well of fuel as of the sources of commercial wealth. Before entering upon that industrial stage in which she has distanced all other countries, England had reached a high stage of agricultural development; she has now acquired such a momentum that she could possibly survive as an industrial nation the exhaustion of her mineral wealth; but she could never have emerged from the agricultural state and attained her present industrial, commercial, and financial standing without her abundant supplies of tin, copper, iron, and coal. In the earlier period the center of her population, power, and wealth lay in the south, where the richest agricultural districts are found; but in the present period this center has moved northward, where exist the sinews of manufacturing and commerce. Geological maps and maps showing the distribution of population, of wealth, and even of political parties, are very significant when studied in relation. Eastern Yorkshire and western Lancashire are strongly conservative in politics; western Yorkshire and eastern Lancashire tend to radicalism; the eastern part of the one county and the western part of the other are mainly agricultural districts, where the influence of the upper classes and of the farmers is decisive, while within these limits lies a great manufacturing, mining, and trading population, with wit, education, and radical opinions. "Those who examine Lancashire schools are struck," says Professor Bryce, "by the difference between the sharpness of the boys in the east Lancashire hill country and the sluggishness of those who dwell on the flats along the coast between Liverpool and Morecambe." The mines of Lanca-

shire called manufactures into being and created trade; and these factors, with all that they imply, have changed the region from a fastness of Toryism into a hive of Radicalism. So true is it, as Mr. Green says, that "history strikes its roots in geography; for without a clear and vivid realization of the physical structure of a country the incidents of the life which men have lived in it can have no interest or meaning. Through history again politics strike their roots in geography, and many a rash generalization would have been avoided had political thinkers been trained in a knowledge of the earth we live in, and of the influence which its varying structure must needs exert on the varying political tendency and institutions of the peoples who part its empire between them."

The foregoing illustrations will make plain Professor Bryce's very useful distinctions. At the same time, the elements into which he resolves environment are always more or less mixed up in history; and since it requires some skill to separate them, it will be better, in teaching the elements of the subject, not to attempt careful analysis but to handle the factors in groups. Some illustrations of this method may be presented.

Mr. Buckle points out that the growth of civilization is possible only in countries having a class of men who possess the time, the disposition, and the means to observe and to investigate the various subjects upon which such growth depends, as the facts of Nature and the laws of the human mind. But a class of men in the possession of leisure, disposition to study, and opportunity to study, can exist only in countries where there is a sufficient accumulation of wealth to free them from the necessity of constant physical toil. Obviously, if every man is intensely absorbed in the struggle for physical existence, society can not move forward. Thirdly, the accumulation of wealth depends upon natural factors; soil and climate condition the rewards of labor, climate conditions the energy and constancy of labor. Hence, fourthly, those countries were sure to become the earliest

seats of civilization where Nature provided good opportunities for the accumulation of wealth, and so the material possibility of study and mental progress. Finally, he remarks that such conditions existed in Hindostan and in Egypt, in Central America, in Mexico, and in Peru, countries that became early if not the earliest seats of civilization on their respective continents. Herodotus called Egypt the gift of the Nile. The Nile Valley is a thick deposit of the richest soil, which the annual overflow of the river constantly replenishes ; the rainless sky and the equable temperature make continuous labor possible, while the river furnishes the source of natural or artificial irrigation. The early husbandman was assured good harvests and abundant food, and thus the first condition of progress was secured.

Greece affords one of the best illustrations of the effect of environment upon historical development. The psychological effects of the sky and atmosphere have already been mentioned. The geniality of the climate tends to moderation in eating and to the use of light clothing, necessities that the country well supplied ; as a result, man was not compelled to undergo grinding toil to procure the means of material subsistence, and so was left with time to indulge the disposition to investigate, which all the influences that played upon him tended to create. The country is a peninsula, or rather a complex of peninsulas, the whole singularly pierced by gulfs and bays, as well as crossed and recrossed by mountain ranges, and so divided into a great number of small plains and valleys, each more or less cut off from the others, at the same time that it lies open to the sea. At no point is the traveler far from the seashore, and at few points is he out of sight of the great mountain mass of Parnassus, which occupies such an important place in Greek history. It is said to be very difficult for one who has never visited Greece to realize the diminutive scope of its geography. Attica and Ægina together contain no more than seven hundred and fifty square miles of territory, and in antiquity they never had a population exceeding half a million people.

In addition to this remarkable accessibility from the sea, attention must be drawn to the larger geographical relations of Greece—to the islands, large and small, that surround it on all sides except the north ; to the not distant shores of Thrace, of Asia Minor, of Africa and of Italy ; to the Black Sea, to the Nile, and to the Mediterranean. In these factors scholars have found causes of the most prominent features of the Greek mind and life ; the wonderful mental gifts of the people, their seafaring, trading, and colonizing habits, their free, adventurous spirit, and especially their political institutions, and the whole form and spirit of their public life. In her early history Greece contained about as many independent states as she had definite units of territory, plain or valley ; a state of things that resulted in a free and vigorous political life, marked by intense patriotism and local spirit, but tending to division and strife, to the lack of general political ideas, to internal war, to what the Germans call particularism, and Americans States-rights, and so to eventual weakness. The final result was, since these divisive and separatist tendencies could never be overcome, that Greece became a prey to internal faction and external force. Environment, first by contributing to the creation of the people, and then to the direction and control of their activity, certainly had much to do with causing the brilliant development and early decadence of the Grecian race. It was no miracle and no accident that the first European civilization, and in some respects the greatest European civilization, sprang up in Greece.

As a rule, the location of cities has been controlled by what Mr. Mackinder happily calls "geographical selection." Two excellent examples of such selection may be borrowed from that writer. On the northeast of the Ganges Valley lie the vast Himalayas, practically impassable to man ; on the northwest is the Sulaiman range, pierced by passes through which numerous conquerors have entered India from the uplands of Iran. Parallel with the Sulaiman is the Thar, or great Indian Desert. Between the desert and the

Himalayas the fertile belt is closely contracted, forming a pass that affords the only approach to the valley at that extremity. Close to the eastern end of this pass, at the head of the Ganges navigation, stands Delhi, the natural center of commerce and the natural base of military operations in all that region. At its eastern extremity the valley is very inaccessible, owing to the absence of natural harbors and to the heavy surfs that beat upon the shore. But the mouth of the river is a great water-gate for the interior, and here on the Hoogly, at the intersection of ocean and river transportation, a natural base of naval and military operations, the British have built up Calcutta. The fertility of the Ganges Valley is proverbial ; at its extremities are found the two gates of India, and it is quite in the nature of things that these gates are held by the cities of Delhi and Calcutta.

Alexander located the city that bears his name at the intersection of the Mediterranean and Nile commerce, having particularly in view the control of the most southern of the old lines of communication between the Indies and the West. For many centuries Alexandria was the grand depot from which the Indian goods were distributed throughout the Mediterranean basin. Constantinople is the gate both to the Black Sea and the Ægean, both to southeastern Europe and northwestern Asia, according as you approach it from the one direction or the other. This city also sits upon one of the old channels of Eastern commerce.

Study of the cities of Italy is peculiarly interesting. Rome was probably founded by shepherds, who, moved by volcanic disturbances or by an insufficiency of pasture lands, or by both, descended with their flocks and herds from their ancestral seats on the Alban Hills into the extensive and fertile plain watered by the Tiber and encircled by mountains and the sea that has long been known as the Campagna. Coming to the conspicuous group of hills and ridges near the river, they seized and fortified the Palatine, which best met their need of a dwelling place and a protection. Livy describes Rome as situated on healthy hills, by a

convenient river, equally adapted to inland and maritime commerce, the sea not too far off to prevent a brisk international trade, or so near as to expose it to the danger of a sudden attack from foreign vessels; a site right in the center of the peninsula—a site made, as it were, on purpose to allow the city to become the greatest in the world. No whit inferior were the military and political advantages of the site.

In the first place [says Professor Goldwin Smith], her position was such as to bring her into contact from the outset with a great variety of races. The cradle of her dominion was a sort of ethnological microcosm. Latins, Etruscans, Greeks, Campanians, with all the mountain races and the Gauls, made up a school of the most diversified experience, which could not fail to open the minds of the future masters of the world. How different was this education from that of a people which is either isolated, like the Egyptians, or comes into contact perhaps in the way of continual border hostility with a single tribe! . . . In the second place, the geographical circumstances of Rome combined with her character would naturally lead to the foundation of colonies, and of that colonial system which forms a most important and beneficent part of her empire.

The great change in their circumstances wrought a gradual change in the character of the primitive shepherds and their descendants. They took on one that better suited their new position. Planted as they were in a meeting place of nations, brought into close and constant competition with the strongest peoples of Italy, the Romans developed those practical, industrial, and business habits, and those military and political virtues that finally gave them universal empire. Rome made the Romans quite as much as the Romans made Rome. Hidden away in some out-of-the-way place, there is not the slightest reason to think that they would ever have made a name in history. All roads led to Rome before the first one had been built.

It is interesting to observe the relations of the principal cities of Northern Italy to the great valley of the Po on the

one side and to the mountain passes that connect the Peninsula with Central and Western Europe on the other. Turin commands the approach to the Mont Cenis Pass from the south. Milan, which has as changeful a history perhaps as any city in Europe, stands almost in the mouths of the Simplon and St. Gothard passes. Verona is at the opening of the Brenner. It is difficult to imagine a state of things in Northern Italy other than complete barbarism in which Milan would not be an important city. At first one might not detect the hand of geographical selection in the case of Venice. Still, under the extraordinary circumstances of the times in which it was founded its site was happily chosen. In his course of destruction, Attila obliterated many towns, including the colony of Aquilia, which stood at the head of the Adriatic, in some such relation as Trieste stands to-day. The homeless inhabitants of Aquilia sought refuge among the islands formed by the detritus brought down to the gulf by the network of rivers that rise in the Alps and that discharge themselves on that shore. This immigration was the beginning of Venice. Shut in by the sea, cut off from the land, protected by her inaccessibility, favored in later times by the Eastern Empire, and planted on what was long the best route for the conveyance of the rich products of Indian commerce to Central and Western Europe, Venice slowly raised her obscure head above the mud of the lagoons, developed a population rich in practical talents and in genius, and won and long held a foremost place among the powers of the world.

Not to mention other writers, both Mr. Green and Mr. Mackinder have graphically described the physical factors that contributed to the founding of the great British metropolis, in the position of which lay whole volumes of English history. "That many causes conspire to maintain the greatness of London," says Mr. Mackinder, "is a fact to be marked. It is the secret of its persistent growth from the earliest times. The importance of the given geographical features varies with the degree of man's civilization. A

city which depends on one physical advantage may fall at any moment. A single mechanical discovery may effect the change." In connection with London, Green's Short Geography and Huxley's Physiography may be studied with much advantage.

Geographical selection is easily recognizable in the location of the large cities of our own country. New York has clearly demonstrated its superiority to all other points on the Atlantic coast as a great mart of trade. At the time of the Revolution both Boston and Philadelphia surpassed it in population, but once connected with the West by a great line of internal communication, the Erie Canal, its extraordinary growth began. It should have been perfectly apparent from the first opening up of the Great West to the light of civilization, that whenever that vast region should become the seat of empire, there would be a great center of population, trade, and wealth at the head of Lake Michigan, at or near where Chicago stands. San Francisco is only the redemption of Nature's pledge that a great city would spring up at the Golden Gate whenever the Pacific Slope should really come into the possession of civilized men.

In such a sketch as the present one the sea calls for little more than casual mention. That it modifies climate, changing temperature and distributing moisture, and so bringing fertility of soil ; that it affects the character and habits and the pursuits of men and nations ; that it yields rich harvests of wealth to the industry of man—furs, fish, pearls, sponges, corals, ivory, amber, salt, oil, and chemicals ; that it furnishes the great highways of commerce and of war, and opens to the statesman and jurist a whole volume of questions that profoundly affect human progress—these are commonplaces. The influence of sea currents, of the trade winds and the monsoons upon human society, is suggested, if not worked out, in every book of physical geography. On the maritime and naval side history does full justice to the theme. Witness such volumes as those of Captain Mahan's *The Influ-*

ence of Sea Power upon History, and The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire.

In the British Islands we have the most notable example of the effect of insular conditions, physical and human, upon civilization. Speaking of the special political attributes of an island, Professor Goldwin Smith finds that it is likely to be settled by a bold and enterprising race, devoted to political liberty ; that the spirit of freedom and independence of this race is likely to be intensified by the very process of migration ; that the island is likely to be free from invasion, and so be left to develop in its own way ; that its isolation tends in the same direction, and that an insular position gives birth to commerce and calls out the corresponding elements of political character. Add to these attributes the climate of Great Britain, its agricultural and mineral resources, and its relations to the continent of Europe and the Atlantic Ocean, and we have the principal natural factors that have contributed to its greatness. Here are the causes, in great degree, of England's vast colonial empire. It may be observed, too, that no one can imagine in what different directions English history would have run had the country been trampled under the feet of invading armies, like France, Germany, or Italy, as to some extent must have been the case had not the English Channel prevented.

What has been said in this chapter is but a meager treatment of a great subject. It will, however, serve to explain the stress that historians place on environment, and also emphasize the observations of a distinguished living scholar :

A national history, as it seems to us, ought to commence with a survey of the country or locality—its geographical position, climate, productions, and other physical circumstances as they bear on the character of the people. We ought to be presented, in short, with a complete description of the scene of the historic drama, as well as with an account of the race to which the actors belong. In the early stages of its development, at all events, man is mainly the creature of physical circumstances ; and by a system-

atic examination of physical circumstances we may to some extent cast the horoscope of the infant nation as it lies in the arms of Nature.

Still, we can not too much emphasize the fact that environment does not make the nation or build the city. Geographical selection points the way, but man does the work. Sometimes, indeed, he seems to disregard the directions. Read Macaulay's eloquent description of Tyre, built on a bare rock in the midst of the sea ; of Venice, rising out of the lagoons of the Adriatic ; of Amsterdam, reared upon a desolate marsh covered with fog. Then there is St. Petersburg, that Tsar Peter built in a swamp inundated by the Neva, by the tide, and by on-shore storms. Much stress must also be placed on what Mr. Mackinder calls "the momentum acquired in the past. . . . Milford Haven, in the present state of things, offers far greater physical advantages than Liverpool for the American trade ; yet it is improbable that Liverpool will have to give way to Milford Haven, at any rate in the immediate future. It is a case of *vis inertia*." The location of our National capital was the effect of causes that no longer exist ; at present it is very far from satisfactory to large portions of the country ; but there is not the slightest probability at present of some Western city taking the place of Washington. Chicago may not have been the best site for the great center of collection and distribution at the head of Lake Michigan ; but it has acquired such momentum, that not even its total destruction could now effect a change so long as the site remains inhabitable.

CHAPTER XI.

HUMAN CAUSES THAT ACT IN HISTORY.

References.—Aristotle: The Politics (VII, 7); Flint: The Philosophy of History in Germany and France (Introduction); Guizot, History of Civilization; Lecky: History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe (Introduction), The Political Value of History; Carlyle: Heroes and Hero Worship; Buckle, Draper, Bryce, Mackinder, and Lavissee, as before.

Marsh: The Earth as Modified by Human Action (Introduction).

It must not be supposed that environment alone accomplishes any historical result. Environment acts upon and through man, contributing to the formation of his character and conditioning his activities. In the truest sense, Nature is not an historical cause at all. History is not primarily a study of circumstances, but of the human agents that exist and act among circumstances; not a study of environment, but of what man does acting under environment. Hence the paramount importance of the topics to be presented in this chapter.

Human nature sums up the main historic causes and agents; the native and universal qualities of the race, the complex of characters that mark man off from inferior creatures. Sagacious as are some species of animals, we have no difficulty in distinguishing the works of man from their works—the ant, the bee, or the beaver. How human nature originates—whether it is the product of development from an inferior nature, as the evolutionists tell us, or the product of an original creative act, subsequently modified by external conditions—is a question quite apart from our

present purpose. The main fact is, that man, irrespective of his origin, is the subject of history. Although hedged about with metes and bounds, he is capable within certain large limits of rising above circumstances or conditions and of asserting a lordship over Nature. Man, then, is the starting point in studying history. The teacher need not indeed begin with psychology, or with a theory of human nature ; moreover, since this is constantly assumed and generally understood, formally to introduce it on every occasion would be the merest pedantry ; still, there are times when some analysis may be profitably indulged in, as in inquiring into the causes of the slave trade and of wars of conquest. These remarks premised, we may enter upon a more detailed examination of our subject.

I. How far race character and national character are due to native inherent qualities, and how far to environment, is a hard question, but fortunately one that lies outside of our present field. Certainly they are among the most potent of historical causes. In a celebrated passage Aristotle pointed out the obvious contrast between the repose of Asia and the energy of Europe. After speaking of the number of citizens of a state, he proceeds to speak of what should be their character :

This is a subject which can be easily understood by any one who casts his eye on the more celebrated states of Hellas, and generally on the distribution of races in the habitable world. Those who live in a cold climate and in [northern] Europe are full of spirit, but wanting in intelligence and skill ; and therefore they keep their freedom, but have no political organization, and are incapable of ruling over others. Whereas the natives of Asia are intelligent and inventive, but they are wanting in spirit, and therefore they are always in a state of subjection and slavery. But the Hellenic race, which is situated between them, is likewise intermediate in character, being high-spirited and also intelligent. Hence it continues free, and is the best governed of any nation, and, if it could be formed into one state, would be able to rule the world. There are also similar differences in the different tribes of Hellas ; for some of

them are of a one-sided nature, and are intelligent or courageous only, while in others there is a happy combination of both qualities.

Summing up the teachings of Baron Montesquieu, Professor Flint tells us that—

Every civilized people is pervaded by a common spirit, which is in fact but another word for the whole of its civilization, and which is the substance of its life, the chief source of its actions, carrying along with it those who are unconscious of it and those even who wish to resist it, incapable of being changed otherwise than slowly and by the concurrence of many agencies, and feebly modifiable by laws, while so profoundly operative on them as to be able to make them either honored or despised.

The national character of the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans—the first religious, the second philosophical and literary, and the third practical and legal in their genius—are historical factors of the greatest value and consequence. Such factors should be studied both with reference to the causes that produce them and the effects that they themselves produce. Hereafter we shall have occasion to speak of the Spanish, French, and English characters as they reveal themselves in early American history.

II. To analyze the genius of the age—what the German calls the Time Spirit—showing what it is, how it comes, and why it goes—is no easy task. That it exercises a controlling power, subordinate only to race and national character, can not be doubted. Great events can not be accomplished until the world is ready for their accomplishment. The New Testament teaches that the greatest event in human history, the most supernatural, demanded a long previous preparation : when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son. At one time the dogmatic spirit, at another time the scholastic spirit, at a third the spirit of classical antiquity, and then again the rationalistic or modern spirit, has swayed the minds of men.

The Time Spirit creates the age. Some things can be done but once. The world will not see the Crusades repeated:

The mediæval cathedrals, which, as has been said, "often rose out of towns which were then little better than collections of hovels, with but small accumulations of wealth, and without what we now deem the appliances of civilized life, and that also mark the highest ascent of man's spiritual nature above the realities of his worldly lot," can not be duplicated. We do not anticipate new migrations of nations like those that broke up the Roman Empire, and a second age of maritime discovery is impossible.

The spirit of the age is not the creature of chance, but is the product of causes that may in part be discovered. For example, as one has observed, every great change of belief in Europe has been preceded by a great change in its intellectual condition; the success of any opinion has depended less upon the force of its arguments or the ability of its advocates than upon the predisposition of society to receive it, while this predisposition results from the intellectual type of the age. Men do new things because they want to do them, and they cease doing them because they have come to feel more interest in something else. So they change their opinions, not so much because they are convinced by formal arguments of the unsoundness of the old and of the soundness of the new, as because they grow out of the old and grow into the new.

III. Individual genius is an historic cause. To adjust the great man and his time is almost as difficult as it is to adjust free will and universal causation. How far is the great man a cause, how far an effect? At this point two divergent tendencies of thought present themselves.

✓ Carlyle emphasizes in the strongest manner individualities, and denounces the opposite tendency as machine-like and degrading. He sneers at all attempts to account for the great man, as to show that he is a product of the times, and maintains that universal history, "the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the history of the great men who have worked here." His doc-

trine is that "history is the essence of innumerable biographies."

Mr. Buckle is perhaps the best representative of the counter tendency. He makes almost nothing of individualities, denies the fact of free will, and resolves history into a necessary sequence, the action of general causes. The reasons by which writers of this class maintain their view within the political sphere, Mr. Lecky thus summarizes :

In the sphere of politics a similar law prevails, and the fate of nations largely depends upon forces quite different from those on which the mere political historian concentrates his attention. The growth of military or industrial habits; the elevation or depression of different classes; the changes that take place in the distribution of wealth; inventions or discoveries that alter the course or character of industry or commerce, or reverse the relative advantages of different nations in the competitions of life; the increase and still more the diffusion of knowledge; the many influences that affect convictions, habits, and ideals, that raise or lower or modify the moral tone and type—all these things concur in shaping the destinies of nations. Legislation is only really successful when it is in harmony with the general spirit of the age. Laws and statesmen for the most part indicate and ratify, but do not create. They are like the hands of the watch, which move obedient to the hidden machinery behind.

The truth lies between these two extremes. Both individualities and general causation play important parts in history. Peter the Hermit must preach the Crusade, Luther must lift up the banner of the Reformation, Napoleon must lead the armies of the Revolution; but, on the other hand, the world must be ready for Peter the Hermit, for Luther, and for Napoleon, or he will accomplish little or nothing. Certainly the mere effervescence and fermentation of society in itself leads to nothing useful and permanent. The crusading spirit did not preach the Crusade, mere reforming tendencies did not nail the theses to the church door or confront Charles V at Worms, the Revolution as a *Zeitgeist*

did not overrun and conquer all Western and Central Europe. Carlyle, in his hero worship, scouts the very conditions that make the hero possible ; Buckle, in his devotion to history as a science, overlooks the hero altogether. "The times," says Carlyle, "have indeed called loudly enough for the great man, and he has not answered." To which Mr. Buckle might reply with equal truth, "The great man has indeed called loudly enough to the times, and the times have not answered." M. Compayré tells us very truly that "the most brilliant personality can do nothing if the society in which it finds itself is not propitious, if circumstances do not second its action." Guizot very properly makes great men, as Charlemagne and Alfred, one of the elements of civilization in the eighth and ninth centuries, when Europe was laboring to emerge from her barbarous condition.

While emphasizing the force of main historical currents, Mr. Lecky still assigns an important place to "men of genius, who are commonly at once representative and creative. They embody and regulate the tendencies of their time, but they also frequently materially modify them, and their ideas become the subject or the basis of the succeeding developments." He observes further that men like Bacon, Descartes, and Locke "have introduced peculiar habits of thought, new modes of reasoning, new tendencies of inquiry," thus giving a powerful causal impulse first to the higher literature and then to the more popular writers ; and also that, since invention and material change create intellectual influences—since a railroad, for example, can not be laid down without an intellectual result—"it is probable that Watt and Stephenson will eventually modify the opinions of mankind almost as profoundly as Luther or Voltaire." Mr. Lecky also tells us that, "though there are certain streams of tendency, though there is a certain steady and orderly evolution that it is impossible in the long run to resist, yet individual action and even mere accident have borne a very great part in modifying the direction of history." He avows the opinion that if Mohammed had been killed in one of his

first skirmishes, Mohammedanism, with its prodigious consequences, would have been unheard of ; also the opinion that if Charles Martel had been defeated at the battle of Tours, the course of European history would have run in very different channels ; and asks, finally, what the result would have been " if, at the French Revolution, the supreme military genius had been connected with the character of Washington rather than with the character of Napoleon."

Without entering further into the speculative discussion of the subject, we shall altogether miss the mark unless we recognize the force and value of the leaders of mankind, who are genuine historic causes of great potency. The history of no country more forcibly illustrates the regular and orderly flow of historical causation than our own ; but it is impossible to conceive what our history would have been without Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Marshall, Lincoln, and Grant.

Among the potent causes that act in history—in war, politics, religion, industry, and trade—ideas and sentiments must be assigned a high rank. Under every historical movement can be found some human factor that transcends mere physical causation. Even the most repulsive political and military struggles can be made intelligible by referring them to human motives. Armies have sometimes been counted the playthings of kings, and war their pastime. But the couplet—

" But war 's a game which, were their subjects wise,
Kings would not play at," [Not so in other cases similar.]

is only partly true. Ambitious rulers have much to answer for, but war has not often been mere ruthless slaughter, killing for the sake of killing ; on the contrary, state policies or national ideas are almost always more or less involved. Rome and Carthage contested the supremacy of the Mediterranean Sea ; they represented antagonistic ideas and policies, and the best interests of mankind demanded that Rome should triumph. The rule of England in India,

harsh as it sometimes seems, promotes the well-being of the people, and autocratic Russia is fulfilling a mission in Central Asia. The destroyers Alaric and Attila embodied the ideas and the passions of the societies that produced them, and from which they derived their power. Napoleon was the child of the Revolution ; Emerson says of him that he succeeded because he was surrounded by little Napoleons, who saw in him only their own aims and desires. "Generally speaking," says Von Moltke, "it is no longer the ambition of monarchs which endangers peace ; the passions of the people, its dissatisfaction with interior conditions and affairs, the strife of parties, and the intrigues of their leaders are the causes."

Now, it is the business of the historian, and of the teacher of history, to bring the ideas, sentiments, and passions that act in human affairs to the surface, and to make them intelligible. Why could not Rome and Carthage live at peace ? What did the Hohenstaufen emperors stand for, and what were the ideas of their foes south of the Alps ? When we pass from wars to campaigns and battles, we are still confronted by ideas, only the teacher must now be careful not to weigh the pupil down with an excess of details. To teach wars, campaigns, marches, and battles merely as facts is very unprofitable employment. Great military commanders have always been men of great minds, and the improvement of weapons, the perfection of army organization, and the extension of transportation facilities and means of supply are constantly making war more and more a matter of science. Not Richard the Lion-hearted, but Count von Moltke is the typical soldier of our times. Then the teacher of military history should recognize the difference between strategy and tactics : the first is the name of movements that bring armies together on the field of battle, the second of movements on the field itself. As a rule these smaller movements should be left to fall out of sight, for they will not be remembered ; commonly it is sufficient to grasp a battle as one transaction, but sometimes a brilliant manoeuvre

vre, a gallant charge, a stubborn defense, will seize the imagination and fix the whole action in the mind.

Such are some of the larger forces that act in history. All or nearly all of them may be separated into parts or elements, but it best answers the present purpose to handle them as units. They also interact, to a degree are mutual causes and effects, and they all work together toward one grand result.

The relations of the two great groups of historic factors are very much a question of time and development. "With each advance of intellectual power, the dependence [of man] upon environment becomes more and more intimate, for with that intelligence the creature seeks beyond itself for opportunities to gratify its desires." So says Professor Shaler. Professor Bryce presents a different view :

Man in his early stages is at the mercy of Nature. Nature does with him practically whatever she likes. He is obliged to adapt himself entirely to her. But in process of time he learns to raise himself above her. It is true he does so by humoring her, so to speak, by submitting to her forces. In the famous phrase of Bacon, *Natura non nisi parendo vincitur*, Nature is not conquered except by obeying her; but the skill which man acquires is such as to make him in his higher stages of development always more and more independent of Nature, and able to bend her to his will in a way that aboriginal man could not do. He becomes independent of climate, because he has houses and clothes; he becomes independent of winds, because he propels his vessels by steam; to a large extent he becomes independent of daylight, because he can produce artificial light.

Mr. Mackinder takes the same view :

The relative importance of physical features varies from age to age, according to the state of knowledge and of material civilization. The improvement of artificial lighting has rendered possible the existence of a great community at St. Petersburg. The discovery of the Cape route to India led to the fall of Venice. The invention of the steam engine and the electric telegraph have rendered possible the great size of modern states.

Touching the last point it may be observed that the American Union probably could not have attained its present proportions, and certainly could not have held permanently together if it had attained them, had these two great inventions never been made.

Thus, in his savage state man is a feeble slave, cowering at the feet of Nature, his foster mother ; while in a state of high civilization he obtains a mastery and lordship over her. Unfortunately, this lordship is not always beneficently asserted. Man shows his power in destruction as well as in construction. Mr. Marsh reminds us that more than one half the extent of the Roman Empire, "including the provinces celebrated for the profusion and variety of their spontaneous and their cultivated products, . . . is either deserted by civilized men and surrendered to hopeless desolation, or at least greatly reduced in both productiveness and population." Both history and architectural remains testify to a population, wealth, and power in Northern Africa, the Greater Arabian Peninsula, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, and many other provinces of Asia Minor, Greece, Sicily, and parts even of Italy and Spain to which they are now and long have been utter strangers. More definitely, the learned author finds the causes of this state of things, partly in geological agents that man can not resist or guide, partly in ignorant disregard of the laws of Nature, as the consequences of war, misrule, tyranny, and despotism. "Man can not struggle at once," he says, "against crushing oppression and the destructive forces of inorganic Nature. When both are combined against him, he succumbs after a shorter or a longer struggle, and the fields he has won from the primeval wood relapse into their original state of wild and luxuriant but unprofitable forest growth, or fall into that of a dry and barren wilderness." We may sum up in the words of M. Lavissee :

Nature has written on the map of Europe the destiny of certain regions. She determines the aptitudes and hence the destiny of a

people. The very movement of events in history creates, moreover, inevitable exigencies, one thing happening because other things have happened. On the other hand, Nature has left on the map of Europe free scope to the uncertainty of various possibilities. History is full of accidents, the necessity of which cannot be demonstrated. Finally, there exists free power of action, which has been exercised by individuals and nations. Chance and freedom of action oppose alike the fatality of Nature and the fatality of historical sequence. To what extent each of these four elements has influenced history cannot be determined with exactness.

CHAPTER XII.

THE TEACHER'S QUALIFICATIONS.

References.—The Duke of Argyll: Iona; Morison: Macaulay (English Men of Letters Series); Bryce: English Historical Review, vol. vii, page 497 (Edward Augustus Freeman); Fiske: Atlantic Monthly, January, 1893 (Edward Augustus Freeman); Morley: Critical Miscellanies, Second Series (France in the Eighteenth Century); Stanley: Historical Memorials of Canterbury; Macaulay: Essays (Mackintosh's History of the Revolution of 1688); Trevelyan: Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay (Chaps. VII, XI); Freeman: Methods of Historical Study; Seeley: Macmillan's Magazine, vol. xlv, page 43 (A Historical Society), id., vol. xlvii, page 76 (On History Again), The Expansion of England, Second Series (History and Politics); Schouler: Magazine of American History, vol. xviii, page 326 (Historical Grouping).

HIS Grace the Duke of Argyll, commenting upon those objects of interest so dissimilar in kind, the two neighboring islands, Iona and Staffa—"Iona dear to Christendom for more than a thousand years; Staffa known to the scientific and curious only since the close of the last century"—observes that "the aspects of Nature will always be more generally attractive than the history of man. . . . It requires," he says, "no previous knowledge, and no preparation of the memory or the imagination, to be impressed by Fingal's Cave. The great hall of columns standing around their ocean floor and sending forth in ceaseless reverberations the solemn music of its waves is a scene which appeals to every eye, which all can understand, and which none are likely to forget. . . . With Iona it is very different. Its interest lies

altogether in human memories. The stranger must bring with him the knowledge and the reflection which alone enable him to enjoy what is of real interest in the associations and in the appearance of the place." These observations, the appositeness of which will not be questioned, happily suggest a contrast between history and science. Whether the student of the one division of knowledge requires a larger preparation than the student of the other, we need not curiously inquire. It is certainly true that the observation and interpretation of the memorials of human life are less easy and congenial to the natural mind than the like processes in respect to the external world, and that the pursuit of history calls for a preparation quite different from that of science.

The qualities that make the successful teacher are not different from the qualities that make the successful historian. That great master of historical learning, Bishop Stubbs, said the author of *A Short History of the English People*, "possessed in no scanty measure all the gifts that contribute to the making of a great historian. He combined, so far as the history of England is concerned, a complete and firm grasp of the subject in its unity and integrity with a wonderful command of details and a thorough sense of perspective and proportion. In him the desire of stating and pointing the truth of history, was as strong as the wish to make both his pictures and his arguments telling and forcible. And then, to add still more to the debt we owe him, there is the wonderful simplicity and beauty of the way in which he tells his tale." The more the items in this bill of particulars are considered, the more will their justness and comprehensiveness appear. They are, grasp of the subject in its unity and integrity, command of details, sense of perspective and proportion, desire to state and point the truth, and ability to tell a tale in a simple and pleasing manner.

Grasp of the subject in its unity and mastery of details are closely related. Manifestly, a subject can not be unified until its elements have been studied. Still, the two powers are not necessarily equal in the same mind; one

person may be distinguished by the number and variety of facts that he has accumulated, another by the completeness with which he has brought them into one general view. The emphasis should be placed with primary reference to the stage of progress that the pupil has made. In elementary work the main thing is the acquirement of facts, in advanced work more attention is paid to their organization.

Sense of perspective and proportion directly involves the truth of history. Any year or period in a man's life must be seen in connection with his life as a whole. The man himself must be viewed in his relations to other men. And so it is with a city or a state. An age must be treated as a part of the whole historical movement before and after. If these familiar rules are disregarded, there is no telling what perversion and distortion will follow.

Desire to state and point the truth hardly needs the emphasis of a single word. History is moral knowledge; rightly handled, it is one of our best moral disciplines and guides, while the critical arguments adduced to settle dates and places and other facts lead to conscientious mental habits, although in a moral sense they may be the least weighty elements to be considered.

Ability to tell a tale in a pleasing way is of prime importance to the teacher as well as to the writer of history. The word "story" is history abbreviated. From the days of Herodotus and Xenophon to the days of Macaulay* and Green, the historians who have been most read have been

* A writer who justly contends that Macaulay's greatest power is his mastery of historical narrative says: "The interest of the story as a story is kept up with a profound and unsuspected art. The thread of the narrative is never dropped. When transitions occur—and no writer passes from one part of his subject to another with more boldness and freedom—they are managed with such skill and ease that the reader is unaware of them. A turn of the road has brought us in view of a new prospect; but we are not conscious for a moment of having left the road. The change seems the most natural thing in the world."—*Morison: Macaulay, Men of Letters Series.*

those who have best told their tale. Nowhere is style more important. For our purpose history that is not interesting is not history at all. There is, indeed, another class of historians : writers who criticise and argue, men like Stubbs and Freeman who have rendered invaluable service to the cause of truth ; but these writers are little known save to scholars and students. In the university historical criticism and discussion should be very prominent, in the college and secondary schools less prominent ; while in elementary work, no matter where done, narration should monopolize the minds of both pupil and teacher.

The principal mental qualities required to teach history according to this model are easily discovered. They are a retentive memory, logical power to analyze and group facts, enthusiasm for the subject, sound judgment, clear insight into character and life, devotion to truth, persistence, vivid imagination, and a copious supply of clear and simple language. Only one or two of these qualities call for particular comment.

In few studies is an enthusiastic interest in the subject so necessary to the teacher. Its presence or absence will commonly determine whether the pupil or class finds the history lesson a dull grind or a pleasant exercise.

Historical insight depends intimately on human sympathy. You can not understand a man unless you can get at his point of view. You need not embrace his opinions or approve his actions, but you must be able, at least measurably, to think and to feel with him. It is because he is richly gifted with this power that the great historian is able to transport us to distant lands or remote ages, to surround us with new scenery, and to make us live a life different from our own. It is partly owing to the same cause that the historian is so apt to lose himself in his hero and become an apologist.

We must now sketch some of the more important divisions of knowledge with which it is desirable that the teacher of history should be acquainted.

First, mention may be made of practical current life. The maxims, "We reason from what we know," and "We proceed from the known to the unknown," nowhere find a more direct application than here. It is a commonplace that the child's political knowledge and training begin with observing facts around him—the policeman, the magistrate, the school board, and the town council. It has been said that when Macaulay "wants to make you understand a thing, he compares it with that which existed in his own day. The standard of the present is always with him." Historians have often been men of affairs. Xenophon and Cæsar were soldiers, Polybius and Clarendon statesmen. Enlarging on this thought, Macaulay says Sir James Mackintosh and Charles James Fox had one eminent qualification for writing history :

They had spoken history, acted history, lived history. The turns of political fortune, the ebb and flow of popular feeling, the hidden mechanism by which parties are moved, all these things were the subjects of their constant thought and of their most familiar conversation. Gibbon has remarked that his history is much the better for his having been an officer in the militia and a member of the House of Commons. The remark is most just. We have not the smallest doubt that his campaign, though he never saw an enemy, and his parliamentary attendance, though he never made a speech, were of far more use to him than years of retirement and study would have been. If the time that he spent on parade, and at mess in Hampshire, or on the Treasury-bench and at Brookes during the storms which overthrew Lord North and Lord Shelburne, had been passed in the Bodleian Library, he might have avoided some inaccuracies ; he might have enriched his notes with a greater number of references ; but he never would have produced so lively a picture of the court, the camp, and the senate house.

Professor Bryce justly tells us that the vivid sense of reality which pervades Dr. Freeman's books is largely due to the keen interest that he took in public affairs, foreign even more than domestic. "He was fond of illustrating features of Roman history from incidents he had witnessed

in taking part in local government as a magistrate, and in describing the relations of Hermocrates and Athenagoras at Syracuse he drew upon observations which, as he told his friends, he made in watching the discussions of the Hebdomadal Council at Oxford." Dr. Freeman himself attributes the failure of some of the German writers to understand the ancient democracies to the fact that they had no first-hand knowledge of free institutions.

On many matters of historical learning an Englishman—an Englishman on either side of the Ocean—is better fitted to judge than a German. A Swiss or a Norwegian may judge of the workings of free constitutions in old Greece, in Italy, in any other land, because he, like the Englishman, has daily experience of their working in his own land. But these things are mysteries to German professors, because they are mysteries to German statesmen also. The German scholar simply reads in a book of things which we are always looking at and acting in. He, therefore, utterly fails to understand many things at Athens, or Rome, or anywhere else, which come to us like our A, B, C.

Mr. Bancroft was an active participant in public affairs ; while Mr. Parkman made ready for his remarkable delineations of wilderness life when passing through the experiences that he has recorded in *The Oregon Trail*. The fact is, no recluse—no mere scholar toiling in his cabinet—although he may heap up historical learning, can write real history. Nor can a person who is out of touch with current life teach real history. No doubt Macaulay's method is a somewhat dangerous one ; but for the child there is no other method ; and we must depend upon later comparison and reflection to correct mistakes.*

* Mr. John Morley, discussing the relative value of political preparation and literary preparation for writing history, makes some remarks that are equally pertinent to the teacher :

"It is indeed plain on the least reflection that close contact with political business, however modest in its pretensions, is the best possible element in

As respects the advantages that arise from contact with living events, American teachers are peculiarly favored. In our democratic society all public affairs are open to every eye. There is no country in the world where the teacher can get closer to the currents of public life.

Argument is not necessary to show that the teacher of history should be a student of the science of government. Political economy also and moral science lie close at hand.

The relations of geography and history have been considered in another place. In addition to studying the theater of history in books and maps, it is desirable that the historian should visit it in person. Thackeray said of Macaulay : "He reads twenty books to write a sentence ; he travels a hundred miles to make a line of description." Macaulay himself tells us that when in Rome he went to the Tiber, to the spot where the old Pons Sublicius stood, and looked about to see how his Horatius, then well advanced, agreed with the topography. His biographer tells us that he saw Glencoe in rain and in sunshine ; that he paid a second visit to Killiekrankie ; that he spent two full days at Londonderry, taking pains to sketch a good plan of the streets, walking alone or in company four times round the walls of the city for which he was to do what Thucydides had done for Platea. Many great historians have been tireless students both of geography and topography.

It is very true that the average teacher of the history of

the training of any one who aspires to understand and reproduce political history. Political preparation is as necessary as literary preparation. There is no necessity that the business should be on any majestic and imperial scale. To be the guardian of the poor in an East-End parish, to be behind the scenes of some great strike of labor, to be an active member of the parliamentary committee of a Trades Council or of the executive committee of a Union or a League, may be quite as instructive discipline as participation in mightier scenes. Those who write concrete history, without ever having taken part in practical politics, are, one might say, in the position of those ancients who wrote about the human body without ever having effectively explored it by dissection."—*Critical Miscellanies : France in the Eighteenth Century.*

the United States will find it impossible to visit in person much of the historic ground with which he deals. But even a few spots well seen assist in understanding others that have not been seen. A few days spent intelligently in the Lake George region, on the field of Gettysburg, at Chattanooga, or Atlanta, will be of permanent advantage in more ways than one. Personal knowledge of the ground gives a wonderful sense of reality to historical knowledge. Roman or Grecian history is never again the same thing to a person who has made a visit to Rome or Athens. Professor Goodwin says: "I can conceive of no better preparation for enthusiastic work than to spend eight months in the study of Greece itself, in viewing her temples and learning the secrets of their architecture, and in studying geography and history at once by exploring her battlefields, her lines of communication through the mountain passes, and the sites of her famous cities." And still another has said: "You can stand on Mount Pentelicus and study history by the hour."

To the teacher of ancient history, or of the history of modern Europe, some knowledge of antiquities is indispensable. Dr. Freeman attached high value to architecture as a handmaid of historical research. He is said to have acquired a wonderfully full and exact knowledge of the most remarkable churches and castles in England, as well as considerable skill in sketching them. By the end of his life he had accumulated a collection of thousands of drawings, made by himself, of notable buildings in France, Germany, Italy, and Dalmatia, as well as in the British Islands. Painting and statuary, as well as philology, bear on many historical problems. A knowledge of antiquities is valuable. Never before has there been so much interest as now in the old Peruvians, in the Aztecs, in the Red Indians, and in the Mound Builders. Then in dealing with these subjects some knowledge of ethnology, or the science of races, is necessary.

Dean Stanley, whose own historical writings derive a vivid sense of reality from his enthusiastic study of geogra-

phy, topography, and historical monuments, says in his lecture on Edward the Black Prince : "Every one who has endeavored to study history must be struck by the advantage which those enjoy who live within the neighborhood of great historical monuments. To have seen the place where a great event happened ; to have seen the picture, the statue, the tomb of an illustrious man, —is the next thing to being present at the event in person, to seeing the scene with our own eyes."

The introduction to the revised edition of *A Short History of the English People*, written by Mrs. Green since her husband's death, sheds a flood of light upon the processes by which the mind of its author was formed. It also illustrates admirably the value to the student of history of participation in real active life, as well as personal study of the historical localities and monuments that lie about him.

John Richard Green was born at Oxford in 1837, and when eight years old was sent to Magdalen Grammar School, then held in a small room within the precincts of the college.

The Oxford world about him was full of suggestions of a past which very early startled his curiosity and fired his imagination. The gossiping tales of an old dame who had seen George III drive through the town in a coach and six, were his first lessons in history. Year after year he took part with excited fancy in the procession of the Magdalen choir boys to the College tower on May Day, to sing at the sun-rising a hymn to the Trinity, which had replaced the mass chanted in pre-Reformation days, and to "jangle" the bells in recognition of an immemorial festival. St. Giles's fair, the "beating of the bounds," even the name of "Pennyfarthing Street," were no less records of a mysterious past than chapel or college or the very trees of Magdalen Walk ; and he once received, breathless and awe-struck, a prize from the hands of the centenarian president of the college, Dr. Routh, the last man who ever wore a wig in Oxford, a man who had himself seen Dr. Johnson stand in the High Street with one foot on either side of the kennel that ran down the middle

of the way, the street boys standing round, "none daring to interrupt the meditations of the great lexicographer." . . .

His curiosity soon carried him beyond Oxford; and in very early days he learned to wander on saints' days and holidays to the churches of neighboring villages, and there shut himself in to rub brasses and study architectural moldings.

At sixteen he read Gibbon, and from that moment the enthusiasm of history took hold of him.

His first historical efforts were spent on that which lay immediately about him; and the series of papers which he sent at the same time to the Oxford Chronicle, on Oxford in the Last Century, are instinct with all the vivid imagination of his later work, and tell their tale after a method and in a style which was already perfectly natural to him. He read enormously, but history was never to him wholly a matter of books. The town was still his teacher. . . . He has left an amusing account of how, on a solemn day which came about once in eight years, he marched with mayor and corporation round the city boundaries. He lingered over the memory of St. Martin's Church, the center of the town life, the folk-mote within its walls, the low shed outside where mayor and bailiff administered justice, the bell above which rang out its answer to the tocsin of the gowmsmen in St. Mary's, the butchery and spicery and vintnery which clustered round in the narrow streets. "In a walk through Oxford one may find illustrations of every period of our annals. The cathedral still preserves the memory of the Mercian St. Frideswide; the tower of the Norman Earls frowns down on the waters of the Mill; around Merton hang the memories of the birth of our Constitution; the New Learning and the Reformation mingle in Christ Church; a grind along the Marston road follows the track of the army of Fairfax; the groves of Magdalen preserve the living traditions of the last of the Stuarts."

And later, when he had left Oxford to enter on the work of a curate in one of the poorest parishes of East London, Mr. Green still continued his studies. Here he made what most men would have thought inconveniences, and even obstacles, help him on his way. Touching in 1869 on the causes of the unpopularity of English history, he wrote :

There is hardly a better corrective for all this to be found than to set a man frankly in the streets of a simple English town, and to bid him work out the history of the men who have lived and died there. The mill by the stream, the tolls of the market place, the brasses of its burghers in the church, the names of its streets, the lingering memory of its guilds, the mace of its mayor, tell us more of the past of England than the spire of Sarum or the martyrdom of Canterbury.

This final extract bears still more closely on the historian's need of personal participation in real life, especially if he essays the history of a people.

To the last he looked on his London life as having given him his best lessons in history. It was with his church wardens, his schoolmasters, in vestry meetings, in police courts, at boards of guardians, in service in chapel or church, in the daily life of the dock-laborer, the tradesman, the costermonger, in the summer visitation of cholera, in the winter misery that followed economic changes, that he learned what the life of the people meant as perhaps no historian had ever learned it before. Every drive, every railway journey, every town he passed through in brief excursions for health's sake, added something to his knowledge.

Of course Mr. Green studied historical documents profoundly, but he never could have used the materials gathered by such study as he did use them had it not been for the deep insight into the life of the people that he had gained by personal experience.

It must be frankly admitted that there is no city on this side of the ocean that can compare with Oxford as a center of historical interest. No city of ours has the mediæval architecture, the memorable localities, the venerable ceremonies and commemorations, the historical associations reaching back a thousand years, the edifices, pictures, and monuments that make so much of the interest and charm of Oxford. The same may be said of our country as a whole. In England you are never out of sight of some interesting village, city, or battlefield; some hall, castle,

church, or cemetery, college or chapel, famous in history, poetry, or song ; some hill, mountain, or heath invested with tale or legend ; some spot forever identified with a man remembered in war or statesmanship, letters or patriotism, science or religion ; some shrine to which the feet of English-speaking men turn from all over the world. It is only the older parts of our country that can show even a blush of interest like this. Faneuil Hall and the State House in Philadelphia are invested with associations dear to Americans ; but these associations are too young, even if there were no other reasons, to permit these places being equalized with Runnymede and Westminster. Since it is only in inferior minds that familiarity breeds contempt, the quick-minded student can not fail to find advantages in England, and in old countries generally, that are denied in a new and immature country like our own. It is not due alone to the fact that our old States have hitherto held the colleges and libraries, the wealth, and the men of leisure, so essential to the production of great historical works, that our Bancrofts, Irvings, Prescotts, Motleys, and Parkmans have belonged to them ; the inspiration and enthusiasm of history belong to historical causes.

But it must not be supposed that American teachers are shut up to books and libraries. Young as our country is, it has a history, and every year is adding the charm that only time can furnish. We may be poor in legend and in ballad, in chronicle and story, in poetry and romance, as compared with England, Scotland, or Switzerland ; but we have made a beginning, and these rich elements will grow. The annals of Indian warfare, whether they relate to the first planting of civilization on these Western shores, or to the still longer and more fiercely contested struggle by which the Great West was wrested from savage men, contain sources of interest that Europe can not match ; the leading events of the Revolution are fast taking their place with the great events that led to the final establishment of liberty in England ; while the Civil War, the whole world has already come to

see, was necessary to the destruction of slavery and the unification of the Republic. The extraordinary growth of historical studies in our country since the War is partly due to causes that have operated in other countries ; partly to the lessons of the War, which turned us back to its causes and the nature and development of political institutions ; partly to the fact that we now have vastly more history to study, and are compelled to read much of the old history in a new light. The main fact is that there are numerous places, scattered over our land, where the historical spirit may feed its fires. These will gain in interest as time goes on. Writing of the Virginia side of the Potomac, opposite Washington, in 1862, Mr. Hawthorne said :

The fortifications so numerous in all this region, and now so unsightly with their bare precipitous sides, will remain as historic monuments, grass-grown and picturesque memorials of an epoch of terror and suffering: they will serve to make our country nearer, dearer, and more interesting to us, and afford fit soil for poetry to root itself in ; for this is a plant which thrives best in spots where blood has been spilled long ago, and grows in abundant clusters in old ditches, such as the moat around Fort Ellsworth will be a century hence. It may seem to be paying dear for what many will reckon but a worthless weed ; but the more historical associations we can link with our localities, the richer will be the daily life that feeds upon the past, and the more valuable the things that have been long established.*

The near past that bounds our view—our very youth—has a compensating advantage. Our history lies in the open day. The fact that we have few unsolvable problems may blunt the edge of curiosity, but it affords a greater probability of ascertaining the truth. That our country offers to the scholars of the world the only example of a large group of independent colonies, planted and developed under new and strange conditions, attaining the proportions of vigorous commonwealths, then asserting their in-

* The Atlantic Monthly, vol. x, p. 49.

dependence and forming an indissoluble Union, afterward attaining under a free constitution a foremost place among the nations of the earth—every step of the whole evolution lying in the clear sunlight of knowledge—is a fact which these scholars are sure to appreciate more and more as time goes on. Witness the monumental works of Dr. Von Holst and Professor Bryce.

The value of wide acquaintance with general literature to the teacher can not well be overestimated. Such acquaintance not only yields anecdotes, incidents, and tales that fail to find their way into formal history, but they show us a multitude of facts after they have been touched by the imagination of the poet or the novelist. Here are inexhaustible materials for illustration. No person could properly teach the history of England and Scotland to a child, unless he knew something of the old minstrelsy. In the same field Scott's novels are indispensable. In our own country such materials do not exist in equal abundance, owing to our youth; but Hawthorne, Longfellow, Lowell, and Cooper are only less important to the teacher than Parkman, Fiske, and Bancroft.

In the short preface to his compilation of *Poems of Places*, Longfellow writes a paragraph about travel that, with slight change in the wording, is just as applicable to history.

I have always found the poets my best traveling companions. They see many things that are invisible to common eyes. Like Orlando in the forest of Arden, "they hang odes on hawthorns and elegies on thistles." They invest the landscape with a human feeling, and cast upon it

"The light that never was on sea or land,

The consecration and the poet's dream."

Even scenes unlovely in themselves become clothed in beauty when illuminated by the imagination, as faces in themselves not beautiful become so by the expression of thought and feeling.

The most important topic has been reserved to the last—a knowledge of history itself. Perhaps there is reason to fear

that the normal schools and the institutes are leading some teachers to think that the first requisite is not knowledge, but methods. No greater mistake could possibly be made. Methods can not be understood until subject-matter has been mastered, and, even if they could be, they would prove empty and useless. Although it was maintained by both Jacotot and Pestalozzi, the most monstrous error in the history of pedagogy is the dogma that a man can teach what he does not know. Even more than in some other subjects ample knowledge is necessary to the best results in this field. Without it the insight, the interest, and the enthusiasm so necessary to success are impossible.

It may be thought that the standard of qualification has been placed high, at least for teachers in elementary and secondary schools. But it is none too high for an ideal. The time has gone by when persons having no knowledge of auxiliary subjects, or even of the main subject save what they have gleaned from the text-book in the hands of their own pupils, or a similar one, should be tolerated in schools as teachers of history. Moreover, the earnest teacher of good abilities can qualify himself in all the subjects that have been named, even if his own school preparation did not include them. He can not, indeed, provide himself with a new mind, but he can accomplish much the same thing by stimulating and developing those powers that are more directly enlisted in studying and in teaching the subject.

CHAPTER XIII.

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY: THE OLD WORLD.

References.—Bunbury: History of Ancient Geography; Freeman: The Historical Geography of Europe, Text and Maps, Methods of Studying History, Geography and Travel, General Sketch of History; Dr. W. Smith: Dictionaries of Greek and Roman Geography, and of the Bible; Bryce: The Holy Roman Empire, Appendix D; Green: A Short History of the English People, The Making of England; Ransome: Elementary History of England; Taylor: Names and Places; Putzger: Historischer Schul-Atlas; Keith Johnston: Physical, Historical, Political, and Descriptive Geography; Gardiner: A School Atlas of English History.

DR. FREEMAN observes that geography in its bearing on history has two meanings or aspects, which tend to run into one another and yet are purely distinct. One aspect is knowledge which may be acquired by the study of books and maps; the other, knowledge that is acquired by means of travel, by actually seeing things with our own eyes. Historical geography corresponds to the first of these forms of knowledge, and has to do with the political divisions of the earth at different times.

“It comes,” he says, “very largely to be a matter of nomenclature; what is the meaning of such and such a geographical name at such and such a time.” Three questions may arise: 1. “Did it mean the same extent of the surface of the earth which it means now?” 2. “Did it reach farther than it does now, or not so far?” 3. “Or did it, as sometimes happens, mean some other part of the earth from what it means now—some part which may not have an inch of

ground in common with the land to which the name is now commonly given?" Questions also arise as to the original meanings of names. Accordingly, he defines historical geography as the knowledge of the names which different parts of the earth's surface have borne at different times, including their origin and signification. How important accurate knowledge of this kind is, as well as how difficult to obtain, this chapter and the following one will illustrate.

First, we may consider the three continents of the Old World and their names. Necessarily, the names could not be used in a continental signification until the distinctness of the continents themselves was recognized; and this, for reasons that are here immaterial, was but slowly effected.

While Homer was acquainted with parts of all these continents, he had no idea of their distinctness and unity; and even Herodotus, who uses the divisions and the names, because they were sanctioned by custom, thought them unreasonable and without good foundation. Sometimes the Nile was regarded as the boundary between Asia and Africa. Nor was there in antiquity any universally recognized boundary between Asia and Europe. The majority followed Hecataeus in making it the Tanaïs, or the Don, but some followed Herodotus, who made it the Phasis, now known as the Faz or Rioni. Even in our own times this boundary is not fixed beyond dispute, some geographers making it the Don and some the Volga. But the different senses attributed to the names arising from special uses and from limited information are far more confusing than those originating in disputes about boundaries. Every one of the three names appears to have been used first in a merely local sense, and afterward to have been expanded with the progress of geographical knowledge.

Asia is used in history in several distinct senses. It is probable that the first Asia was the plain of Lydia, or possibly even the meadow of the river Cayster, and that it was successively applied to the whole peninsula of which Lydia

formed a part, to the parts of the continent abutting on the Mediterranean, and finally to the continent. The name Asia Minor first appears in the fifth century A. D., and its appearance marks the need of a special name for the peninsula, in order to separate it from the continent, or from Upper Asia, as the region beyond the Taurus was called. Asia is sometimes named the kingdom of Troy, sometimes the kingdom of Pergamus, and sometimes Proconsular or Roman Asia. How confusing these Asias are is shown by familiar passages in the book of Acts. St. Paul, being already in Asia, and in Asia Minor, is forbidden "to preach the word in Asia," and at Ephesus is advised by "certain of the chief of Asia, which were his friends," etc. (chaps. xvi, 6; xix, 31). The Asia of these passages is the one last mentioned in the above enumeration.

The Greeks called the second of the great continents, exclusive of Egypt, Libya, and the Romans borrowed the name from them. The Carthaginians called their own region, and perhaps the continent so far as they knew it, *Afric* or *Africus*, and the name passed from them to their conquerors. The Romans at first applied it to the Carthaginian territory, and later to Proconsular or Roman Africa, which was of different extents at different times. Still later Africa took the place of Libya, including Egypt as well, while Libya disappeared from the map.

Perhaps the name of the third continent is of more uncertain origin than either of the others. One theory is that Europe means "Broad Land," and that the Asiatic Greeks gave the name to the extended coast of Thrace to distinguish it from the islands of the *Ægean* Sea and the Peloponnesus. However this may be, the name was used in a continental sense from the time that the geographical unity of Europe was recognized, and is therefore free from uncertainties like those attending Asia and Africa.

Before going farther it will be well to distinguish between geographical and political names. Dr. Freeman defines the first as "a name meaning a certain part of the

earth's surface, marked out by boundaries which can not well be changed"; the second as "simply meaning the extent of country which is occupied at any time by a particular nation, and whose boundaries may be easily changed." Britain is an example of a geographical name; England, Wales, and Scotland are examples of political names. Spain falls into the first class; Castile, Aragon, and Portugal into the second. The same may be said of Gaul and France. Sometimes the same name is both geographical and political, and in precisely the same sense; but such cases are less frequent than we might antecedently expect.

Few names are more curious and instructive than Greece and Greek. The people whom we know as Greeks called themselves Hellenes, and their country Hellas. At first the Hellenes were but a single tribe occupying a small district in Thessaly. The southern part of the easternmost of the three Mediterranean peninsulas was, however, occupied by a group of affiliated tribes or peoples. It was always understood that Hellas was the country of the Hellenes; and as the original tribes and states came more and more to recognize and to value their relationships, and as they became better known to the outside world, the names Hellenes and Hellas were progressively expanded. The geographical unity of the country, as well as the commercial and political relations of the people, worked strongly in the direction of unity. At one time Hellas extended only to the Corinthian Gulf on the south and to the Ambracian Gulf on the north; later, Peloponnesus and Macedonia were included within its boundaries. Nor is this all; the Hellenes were a commercial and a colonizing people, and, in the largest sense of the term, all their colonies and outposts were in Hellas, whether on the Hellespont, the Euxine, or African coast, whether in Spain, Gaul, Italy, or the Islands of the Sea. Still, the two names were not employed in a general sense until after the time of Homer; he calls the motley host that sailed to Troy by a number of different names, but never Hellenes. Even after the names became

common there were numerous controversies as to what tribes were and what were not Hellenes. These controversies, into which political factors entered very deeply, make the definition of the Grecian boundaries at all times difficult. Finally the Romans became acquainted with a small tribe called Græci, living on the coast of Epirus, who were perhaps not Hellenes at all, and they gave the name of this tribe to the whole country and people of the peninsula, thus settling the usage. While Greece was never used in as broad a sense as Hellas, lower Italy, which became thoroughly Græcized, was known as Greater Greece. The present kingdom of Greece, still called Hellas, founded in 1833, embraces but a small part of ancient Greece.

We first meet the name Italy in the lower part of the second Mediterranean peninsula. The Romans, the masterful people who expanded the name, although of the Italian stock, did not live in the original Italy at all. In the time of Julius Cæsar Italy extended north only to the Rubicon, and it was Augustus who first made it include the valley of the Po and the southern slopes of the Alps. At a later time the name was limited to the northern part of the peninsula, and Milan became the capital. On the breaking up of the Frankish Empire a kingdom of Italy was formed in the north, Charles V being the last monarch to wear its iron crown, and a second but short-lived kingdom of the same name was created by Bonaparte in 1805. For a long time the name was without political significance, being, as was said, "a mere geographical designation." Such, in fact, it continued to be until the formation of the present kingdom of Italy, which, however, does not include the whole peninsula or all the Italians. To say nothing of San Marino, considerable parts of Italy still belong to Austria. The necessity of keeping the meaning of names in mind in reading history is well illustrated by the account of Cæsar's passing the Rubicon with his army in defiance of the Senate. This river, which flows into the Adriatic south of the Po valley, was part of the boundary between the province of

Gaul, which Cæsar governed, and the Italy of his day, which the Senate itself governed.

The original Romans were the people of Rome, the town by the river Tiber ; but step by step the name as well as the rights of the Romans were conferred upon all the tribes and nationalities comprehended in the most imposing political structure that the world has seen—the Roman Empire. After the division of the empire, Roman was never used in the West as a general name either of the land or of the people, although it lived on as a part of the name of the empire itself. Nor is the name used in Italy to-day save as applying to the city and to the district called the Romagna ; but in the East its use with a general significance took deep root. The inhabitants of the Eastern Empire knew themselves as Romans to the very end, and the land gradually came to be called Roumania. The potent name made a deep impression upon the Asiatic barbarians who overthrew that empire ; when the Seljook Turks overran Asia Minor their leaders assumed the title Sultans of Roun. Roumania and Roumelia, inhabited mainly by people who speak a language descended from the Latin, and who are themselves supposed to be descended from the colonists whom Trajan established in Dacia, are memorials of the strong impression that the Roman power and name made upon the East. Strangely enough, the name of a people whose great qualities were political and military is now most widely used in a strictly religious signification.

In the widest sense Gaul was the land of the Gauls, or Celts, as Hellas was the land of the Hellenes. In early Roman times, however, the name was used in a much narrower sense. The country so named was divided into Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul—or Gaul on *this* side and Gaul on *that* side of the Alps, speaking from the standpoint of Rome. The first was incorporated into Italy by Augustus. The Gaul that Cæsar describes as divided into three parts, much of which he conquered, extended from the Pyrenees, the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean to the Channel

and the North Sea, exclusive of Provence, which had been subdued in earlier times. This country is the Gaul of the Imperial Period.

When we obtain our first glimpse of Central Europe it is occupied by a group of affiliated nations or tribes calling themselves *Deutsch*—that is, the people or the nation, and whose descendants, living in the same country, still call themselves by the same name. The derivative “Dutch,” however, is strictly limited to the people of the Netherlands. English-speaking men call the *Deutsch* Germans and Teutons, and their country Germany, borrowing the names from the Romans. Where the Romans obtained them is a matter of controversy, but Teuton was the name of a Germanic tribe with which the Romans were brought into contact, and which they used in a generic sense. Broadly speaking, Germany, or *Deutschland*, is the native country of the Germans, or the *Deutsch*; but its ethnological, geographical, and political limits have materially varied at different times, and, in fact the three significations of the word have never fully coincided, at least in modern times. The principal political phases of Germany may be thus particularized :

1. The Germany of Cæsar and Tacitus, consisting of a large number of independent tribes and groups of tribes without cohesion or unity. In this period the Germans are crowding outward, and they soon overflow in all directions.

2. Carolingian Germany, the empire of the Carlings. The Franks, who were one of the largest divisions of the Germans, crossed the Rhine in the fifth century, under Clovis, and established themselves in Gaul. Their power culminated when Charlemagne, their king, having gained the mastery of nearly all Gaul and part of Spain, of Germany and Northern Italy, was crowned Emperor at Rome. Francia, which in this period was the proper country of the Franks, embraced the major parts of Gaul and Germany.

3. The German kingdom. Soon after the death of

Charlemagne, which occurred in 814, his empire broke up. East Francia, the country between the Rhine and the Elbe, and West Francia now fell apart and were never reunited. In East Francia there grew up the German kingdom, the real greatness of which dates from Otto the Great, crowned in 936. This kingdom, called also the German Empire, passed through many changes and stood in important relations to all the powers of Western Europe. The German kings wore, or were entitled to wear, four crowns—the royal crowns of Germany, Burgundy, and Italy, and the imperial crown of Rome. Charles V was the last monarch who was actually crowned Roman Emperor. The kingdom was a confederacy, the head of which was originally elected by the German princes collectively, but afterward by a certain fixed number of them, called electors. Still, the crown tended to become hereditary in some great reigning family that could bring to the office strength in exchange for dignity and a great title. It must be remembered, however, that Burgundy and Italy were not parts of Germany, but were rather foreign dominions of the German kings until they fell away from his grasp. The Empire, and the German kingdom, came to an end in 1806 in consequence of the Napoleonic wars. Francis II then renounced the imperial crown and assumed the new title of Emperor of Austria.

Here it may be observed that European history, and especially in mediæval times, can not be understood without a clear and firm grasp of the Holy Roman Empire, the name by which the imperial dominions of the kings or emperors were known. Often, however, it was called merely The Empire.

4. The German Confederation. This was a loose federal union formed of all the proper German states in 1815. The kings of England, the Netherlands, and Denmark were members of the body for their German dominions, as the King of England for Hanover. The Emperor of Austria was the hereditary president of the diet, representation in which was regulated by fixed agreement. Austria and

Prussia were the leading members of the confederacy, and their rivalry finally destroyed it.

5. The German Empire. In 1866 the German Confederation came to an end, and the North German Confederation was formed under the leadership of Prussia. Austria and the other South German states were not included. In 1870, when the Franco-Prussian war was in progress, all these excluded states but Austria joined the Northern Union, and the next year the present German Empire was organized, the crown being invested in the reigning family of Prussia. Some of the old states were now merged in Prussia; the old German lands of Alsace and Lorraine, that had been wrested from France in the course of the war, were reannexed to Germany, and Austria, with a German population of more than ten million, was shut out of political Germany altogether.

Perhaps no name in European history is more confusing than Austria. Austria-Hungary is composed, as the name itself suggests, of two parts, each of which is an agglomeration of older states and parts of states. Hungary consists of the old Hungarian kingdom together with other lands, and does not require further description. Austria dates from the time of the early German kings, who founded, as a bulwark against the Hungarians, a mark, march, or border state, called Oesterreich, Ostmark, Eastmark, or Austria. By and by the mark became a duchy, then an archduchy, and toward the end of the thirteenth century it passed into the possession of the house of Hapsburg. In one way and another the Austrian princes won power; the imperial crown came to them; they gained new territories in Germany, in Italy, in Poland, in Hungarian and Turkish lands—not all of which, however, ever became parts of Austria proper. They were known by a great number of titles: in their original dominions as archdukes; in Bohemia and Hungary as kings; in their other states as counts, dukes, margraves, etc.; while in Germany at large and through Europe they were styled Emperors. The head of this com-

posite state assumed the title Emperor of Austria when he renounced the imperial crown in 1806. He is now known as emperor in Austria and in Europe generally, but as king in Hungary—a point on which the Hungarians are very sensitive. Austria proper consists of fourteen different parts, eleven of which belonged to Germany previous to 1866.

The original Prussia, a province on the Baltic Sea that the Teutonic Knights had won from the heathen, was not German at all. In the sixteenth century it passed to the Elector of Brandenburg, one of the seven electors of the German kingdom, and in 1701 the Elector assumed the title King of Prussia. His kingdom lay partly within and partly without Germany. As a German prince he was called an elector, but as a European prince he was known by his higher title. Step by step Prussia has grown in all directions, until it is now far larger than any other German state. At present Prussia is all included in Germany, although a considerable part of the population, as the Poles and the Pomeranians, are not Germans.

Reference has been made to the division of Francia in the ninth century. The old name was reserved in both divisions; in the west it became France, in the east Franconia. Western Francia, or Latin Francia, which corresponded in a general way to ancient Gaul, following the breaking up of Charlemagne's empire, was divided into a great number of small political bodies, which, like all such bodies at that time, were endowed with the strongest repellent qualities. These bodies were not only without natural boundaries for the most part, but they were all divisions of a great region or country that was strongly marked by geographical unity and coherence. The Alps and the Mediterranean, the Pyrenees, the Atlantic, and the Channel wall this region about, save in one quarter. On the northeast, or the side of the Rhine, it lies open, thus affording a highway of war that armies have often trodden. In course of time the political and military elements existing in the tenth

century were brought together and thoroughly integrated, producing modern France. It is common to assign this great and beneficial work to the skill and policy of Hugh Capet and his successors, re-enforced by the great qualities of their people; but the material factors in the problem are no less potent than the human ones. Moreover, beyond the limits that Nature set for her, France, although one of the great military powers of history, has never succeeded in permanently extending her boundaries. Nor has she at any time been threatened with serious loss within these limits. Only on her one open side have her boundaries been unstable.

Spain is a country of a strongly marked character, both geographical and historical. Minutely to set forth the political changes that have taken place within it would require a volume. Only two or three facts can here be mentioned.

In the eighth century the Saracens conquered the larger part of Spain; the mountainous north, however, preserved its independence under a line of princes claiming to represent the old Gothic kings, and in time it became the Kingdom of Leon. This kingdom was the original center of resistance to the Mohammedans. Progressively, as the country was won back bit by bit from its conquerors, there grew up a circle of counties and kingdoms the relation of which to one another and to Leon are curiously blended and confused. The most prominent of these were Navarre, which extended over the Pyrenees, Aragon, Portugal, and Castile—the last so called because at first it was a line of castles. Modern Spain was the product of the integration of nearly all these states. To quote Dr. Freeman: "The permanent union of the dominions of Castile and Aragon, the temporary union of the dominions of Castile, Aragon, and Portugal, formed that great Spanish monarchy which in the sixteenth century was the wonder and terror of Europe, which lost important possessions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which was finally partitioned in the beginning of the eighteenth." Castile and Aragon,

which had previously absorbed much Christian territory in the peninsula, gave the finishing blow to the Moorish power the very year that Columbus discovered America. The marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella did not immediately lead to the unification of the two crowns; it is common to refer the union to 1506, but it did not become complete and final until the reign of Charles V. The union of Portugal with the other kingdoms proved to be but temporary. The potency of physical factors is happily illustrated by the fact that so much of the old Navarre as lies north of the Pyrenees is now a part of France, while the remainder is a part of Spain.

It has been seen that the ethnological, geographical, and political meanings of the same name often differ widely. It is perhaps hardly necessary to remark that no student can disentangle and retain in his memory these distinctions unless he is willing to read closely, to scan maps carefully, and to do a great deal of hard thinking besides. It is also necessary that the student shall emancipate himself from the bondage of the modern map; he must live in the geography of the times that he studies.

Many other examples of the shrinkage, the expansion, the disappearance, and the transference of geographical names can be found in the history of Europe. The fact is, every important name is a separate study. How Saxony, Sweden, and Turkey have shrunk up! How Russia has grown! Through what transformations Switzerland has passed! Spain, which was originally a geographical name merely, is now a political name as well. Burgundy and Poland, once so prominent, have wholly disappeared from the map. Indeed, Mr. Bryce describes ten different Burgundies, and then adds that there was very nearly being an eleventh one.

Dr. Freeman remarks with emphasis, that although Cæsar in 55 B. C., and William the Conqueror in 1066 A. D., both landed in the same island, the first landed in Britain, the second in England. The distinction is important, because

the two names suggest very different conditions, and particularly very different peoples.

The people of the Mediterranean who first visited those regions appear to have spoken of the whole group of islands rather than of any particular island as Britain. Still, before Cæsar's day the name had been applied also to the largest island of the group, while its inhabitants, who were Celts, were called Britons. The Roman conquest and occupancy in no way disturbed these names. Soon after the Romans retired beyond the Channel, in 410, bands of Jutes, Saxons, and Angles began to invade Britain; and step by step these invaders, constantly re-enforced from beyond the sea, succeeded in displacing the native inhabitants in a large part of the island. The Britons already had some knowledge of the Saxons, and that is probably the reason why they called the invading host indiscriminately by that name. At all events, they did call them all Saxons, and to this day their descendants in Wales, Ireland, and the Scotch Highlands call the English by some form of that word. But the new people that was gradually formed in Britain called themselves Angles or English, and the country Anglia or England, perhaps because that tribe was more numerous and came to possess more of the land than the others. Still, England never took the place of Britain as a name, for reasons which it is important to state.

The Romans found a people known as the Caledonians in Northern Britain. They were of the Celtic stock. By and by the Picts appear on the scene, they being the same tribe with a new name, or an affiliated tribe who displace or absorb the Caledonians. Glancing at the contemporary map of Ireland, we see that its northern part is called Scotia and its inhabitants Scotti. Thus the original Scotland was North Ireland, and the original Scotchmen were Irishmen. Before the German invasion of Britain began some Scots had crossed the sea and planted themselves on the coast north of the Clyde. These Scots, continually re-enforced by their countrymen in the lesser island, made common cause with

the Picts in warring upon the Britons after the Romans abandoned the island, and also in resisting the Saxons or English as they pressed northward. Moreover, they eventually gave their name to the Picts, as well as to many of the English themselves and to the whole northern part of ancient Britain. The first Nova Scotia was Scotland.

Step by step the English pushed their conquests northward as far as the Highlands, and they actually occupied permanently a great part of the Scottish Lowlands. But the English kings failed to maintain a high northern boundary; on the contrary, there was formed a Kingdom of Scotland, the people of which were partly the old Caledonians, or the Pictish stock, partly the Scots, and partly the Lowland English that finally made common cause with the others. Thus the northern as well as the southern kingdom is known by a foreign name. Caledonia disappeared from the map of the one island as Scotia did from the map of the other. On the perfecting of the union of the kingdoms of England and Wales and of Scotland in 1707, it was ordained that together they should be called Great Britain. And this fact the Scotchman, who is particular to have it understood that his country was never conquered, is strenuous to have remembered. The native name of the Highlander is Gael.

The diverse elements uniting to form the Scottish nation had much to do with the long and bitter feuds between the Highlands and the Lowlands. Sir Walter Scott has made the most of these contentions, as in the speech that Roderick Dhu makes to Fitz James as the two stand upon one of the mountain spurs overlooking the valley of the Forth. This speech emphasizes the fact that the Highlander and the Lowlander were of alien race, and also illustrates the Highland or Gaelic use of the term Saxon.

Saxon, from yonder mountain high,
I mark'd thee send delighted eye,
Far to the south and east, where lay,
Extended in succession gay,

Deep waving fields and pastures green,
 With gentle slopes and groves between :—
 These fertile plains, that soften'd vale,
 Were once the birthright of the Gael;
 The stranger came with iron hand,
 And from our fathers reft the land.
 Where dwell we now ! See, rudely swell
 Crag over crag, and fell o'er fell.

The contrast presented by men occupying mountainous regions and by men occupying plains or valleys has often been remarked. It is particularly observable in the early history of civilization. The man of the mountains retains his primitive habits of character long after his neighbor on the plain below has entered upon the ways of regular civil life ; he continues to live by the chase, on the produce of his few goats or sheep, and perhaps a meager tillage, to raid and murder, and to assert his independence in all ways, when his neighbor has become an agriculturist, a mechanic, or a trader engaged in amassing and enjoying wealth, and takes up his old trade of war only when compelled to do so in self-defense. This story may be read in the relations of the Scotch Highlanders and Lowlanders down to recent times. The mind of the mountaineer continues stern and unbending, his spirit fierce and intractable, brooking no domination, when the Lowlander becomes plastic, versatile, devoted to gain or comfort, and loving quiet and peace even to the point of submitting to severe oppression. Thus mountainous regions not only furnish those who dwell in them fastnesses easy of defense, but they breathe into their inhabitants an intense spirit of individuality and freedom that sometimes renders them invincible. A few thousand Montenegrins withstood for centuries the Ottoman Empire ; and the Swiss, although comparatively few in numbers, and divided by blood, language, and local interests, successfully maintained their independence against some of the greatest powers of Europe. Still the men of the plain have not always tamely submitted to the yoke of the oppressor. Mr.

Kingsley has signalized in an engaging story the stubborn resistance that the men of the Fens under Hereward the Wake made to William the Conqueror; while Mr. Motley has celebrated in learned tomes of history the heroic and successful resistance that the Dutch made to Spain.

Environment tells us why some countries are so subject to foreign invasion. For thousands of years invaders from beyond the central mountain axis of Asia have at times pressed into the great peninsula of Hindostan, seeking its milder climate and its richer fruits. The modern tourist who passes in a day from France or Germany into Italy is at no loss to discover why in ancient times the Celt, the Teuton, and the Hun longed for its beautiful mountains and valleys, and why in later times it has been so fiercely contested by the Frenchman, the Spaniard, the German, and even the Saracen. Then, some countries by their very position and configuration are battlefields of nations or highways of war. Such in ancient times was Palestine, often trodden under foot by the colossal powers of Egypt, Assyria, and Syria. Northern Italy has been a favorite battle ground for countries lying beyond the Alps, while Flanders, Dr. Holmes once said, is the bowling alley in which the kings of Europe have rolled cannon balls at each other's armies. The records of such movements and operations are often read in historical geography.

The English called the Britons Welsh—that is, strangers; and there were two or three Welsh kingdoms in the western parts of the island that maintained their independence through several centuries, and that, when finally subdued, left behind them enduring memorials. Cornwall is the old kingdom of Corn-Wales, or kingdom of the Welsh of the Horn (Corn being derived from the Latin *cornua*); while the Principality of Wales is the Welsh kingdom that Edward I subdued, and that gave a title to the eldest son of the King of England. Still, the people of the Principality do not call themselves Welsh, but Cimri.

So far little has been said about the origin and meaning

of geographical names. Dr. Freeman includes these elements in his definition of historical geography, and Rev. Isaac Taylor writes a book to show us that local names, whether of provinces, cities, villages, rivers, or mountains, are never purely arbitrary sounds destitute of meaning, but are rather records of the past, inviting and rewarding a careful historical interpretation. Sometimes the original meanings have faded out; sometimes they are so doubtful that we can not deduce from them certain conclusions; but in a majority of cases they are not only discoverable but throw much light on historical studies. Geographical names are sometimes chapters of history in themselves. The numerous Alexandrias, Antiochs, and Seleucias scattered over the Macedonian Empire point at once to their founders or to the men for whom they were named. The same may be said of the various Cæsareas, of which Jersey is but a corruption. The cities of Adrianople and Orleans remind us of the Emperors Adrian and Aurelian. Tiberias stands for the emperor of that name, and Constance for Constantius. Philippi was the city of Philip, and our own Philadelphia goes back by the city of the same name in Asia Minor to Philadelphus, King of Pergamus. The three names of the great city of the Bosphorus—Byzantium, Constantinople, and Stamboul—fitly mark the three periods of its eventful history. St. Petersburg is the City of Peter the Great. But such examples as these lie on the surface.

Historical geography shows very conclusively that, at different times, several different peoples have flowed over the major part of Europe, and it also marks in a more or less definite way their metes and bounds, just as an existing moraine marks the former extent of an ancient glacier. First of all, so far as we know, came the race of which the Basques and Finns are remnants; and then followed successive waves of Celts, Germans, Lithuanians, and Slavonians, that have left incontestable proof of their presence in geographical names wherever they went. Celtic names abound in the region west of the Rhine, in Italy, and in the

British islands, and are found beyond these limits. German names are scattered over the western half of Europe. In fact, some of these countries are sown with names in different languages three or four deep, and it is often easy to discover the order in which they are scattered. In Italy, Greek, Latin, Celtic, and German names are found, not to mention still other languages; in France, Celtic, Latin, and German names. In the eighth century the Arabs crossed the Strait of Gibraltar and founded a kingdom in Spain; they also invaded Gaul, the Mediterranean islands, and Southern Italy; and wherever they went they left behind them demonstrative proof of their presence, even if their name should fade from the annals of Europe. In Spain and Portugal, where they remained longest, the memorials of their presence are thousands in number, including many of the best-known names, as Guadalquivir, Gibraltar, Medina, and Trafalgar. At a still earlier time the Phoenicians had given a name to Cadiz.

In Great Britain historical geography shows us the plainest traces of the three races that have ruled the island—the Celts, the Romans, and the English—and also of the invasions of the Scandinavians and the Normans.

Names given to features of country are naturally more permanent than names of towns and political divisions. "Mountains and rivers," it has been said, "still murmur the voices of nations long since denationalized or extirpated." To quote Mr. Taylor: "The river names, more particularly the names of important rivers, are everywhere the memorials of the very earliest races. These river names survive when all other names have changed; they seem to possess an almost indestructible vitality. Towns may be destroyed, the sites of human habitations may be removed, but the ancient river names are handed down from race to race; even the names of the eternal hills are less permanent than those of rivers. Over the greater part of Europe—in Germany, France, Italy, Spain—we find villages which bear Teutonic or Romance names, standing on the banks of streams which

still retain their ancient Celtic appellations. Throughout the whole of England there is hardly a single river name which is not Celtic." The same author prints a map that shows the most thoroughly Saxon and Scandinavian parts of Great Britain to be traversed by rivers whose names are now almost the sole evidence of a once universal Celtic occupation. Often the Celtic name was simply a word that meant water, stream, or river, and so was a common noun, as *afon*, meaning river, and *dur* and *esk*, meaning water. The Saxons also named streams in the same way. Frequently the present name is composed of two or more root words. Thus the Teutons, coming to a stream already called *Dur* or *Door*, added "beck," making *Durbeck*, which means water-stream. *Esk-water* and *Derwent-water* were formed in the same way. *Wansbeckwater* is composed of four parts, and means riverwater-riverwater.

Chester is the Latin *castra*, meaning camp, and the name bears witness to the fact that the city stands on the site of an old Roman fortification. The same may be said of names holding the same word in combination, as *Dorchester*, *Rochester*, *Porchester*, *Manchester*, *Doncaster*, and many more. *Cologne*, or *Köln*, as the German says, is a corrupted form of the Latin *colonia*, and shows us that the Romans had a colony on the site of that city; while *Coblenz* comes from the Latin *confluentes*, and points to the fact that the Romans also occupied the confluence of the Rhine and the Moselle. The syllable "coln" in English *Lincoln* has the same origin as *Cologne*.

It is interesting to observe that *Cologne* is by no means a solitary example of a double name occurring in that region of Europe. We have *Elsass* and *Alsace*, *Lothringen* and *Lorraine*, *Mosel* and *Moselle*, *Mainz* and *Mayence*, *Trier* and *Treves*, *Lüttich* and *Liège*, *Mechlin* and *Malines*, *Löwen* and *Louvain*, *Aachen* and *Aix-la-Chapelle*, and many more. The first name in the several pairs is the older German name, the second one the later French name. The explanation of these double names is partly the fact that the

French have a fashion of adapting names to their own language, and that other peoples, as the English, owing to the general currency of French, commonly adopt these newer forms ; but it is also partly the fact that this region has been a debatable land between Germany and France, at different times in the possession of either people, and so furnishes a valuable lesson in historical geography.

In England a multitude of names are found that suggest the idea of an inclosure, and so of protection. The familiar terminations "ton," "ham," "worth," "stoke," "fold," "garth," "park," "burgh," "bury," "borough," "borrow," all have this meaning. These terminations were added to some other word, as the name of a tribe or family, and in this way were formed many of our most familiar geographical names. The original bond of the Saxon community was blood relationship. "As they fought side by side on the field," says Mr. Green, "so they dwelt side by side on the soil. Harling abode by Harling, and Billing by Billing, and each 'wick' and 'ham' and 'stead' and 'ton' took its name from the kinsmen who dwelt in it. In this way the house or ham of the Billings was Billingham, and the town or township of the Harlings was Harlington." The fact that most of the old centers of population, as London, Winchester, Manchester, Lancaster, and others, bear Celtic or Latin-Celtic names, while other centers bear Teutonic names, suggests that it was in the first that the Celts longest maintained themselves against their enemies ; "while the Teutonic town names usually indicate by their suffixes that they originated in isolated family settlements in the uncleared forest, or arose from the necessities of traffic in the neighborhood of some frequented ford."

The Scandinavians, who played such an important part in English history, would naturally land on the northeastern coast, since it was most convenient to their own country ; and the multitude of Scandinavian names found in that part of the island, separate from all documents, proves that such was the fact.

The names of many English counties are full of instruction. Essex, Sussex, Wessex, and Middlesex were first the names respectively of the kingdoms of the East, South, West, and Middle Saxons, before the Teutonic kingdoms were united. Surrey was the south realm. Norfolk and Suffolk were the northern and southern divisions of the East Anglian folk. Northumberland is the land north of the Humber. Cumberland, Cornwall, Devon, and Kent are the names of Celtic tribes.

Such are a few of the many lessons that we read in the geographical names of the Old World. We shall now study some of the similar lessons written on the map of the New World.

CHAPTER XIV.

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY: THE NEW WORLD.

References.—1. Discovery and early Exploration.—Bancroft's, Hildreth's, and Bryant and Gay's Histories; Winsor: Narrative and Critical History of America (II., III., IV.), Christopher Columbus (IX.–XIX., Appendix, The Geographical Results); Fiske: The Discovery of America (V., VI., VII., XII.); Scaife: America, Its Geographical History, 1492–1892; Parkman: The Pioneers of France in the New World.

2. Interior and Western Exploration.—Winsor, as above; Parkman: Series entitled France and England in North America; J. D. Whitney: The United States (Appendix, A, B).

3. Maps.—MacCoun: The Historical Geography of the United States, Historical Charts of the United States; Hart: The Epoch Maps; also the maps in Winsor.

4. Miscellaneous.—Lodge: A Short History of the English Colonies; Poore: The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, etc.; Taylor: Names and Places; Coxe: The Forum, IV., 67 (American Geographical Names); Redway: Manual of Geography; C. Blackie: Etymological Geography.

IN some respects the historical geography of the New World is even more interesting than that of the Old. It abounds in examples of the enlargement, the shrinking up, the transference, and the disappearance of names. It presents to us aboriginal names in competition with names given by discoverers and explorers, and names of the second class in competition with one another. We meet a multitude of names brought over from Europe. What is more, the whole process goes on in the open light of history—as it

were, under our own eyes—a fact that often makes the lesson more definite and precise.

The first lesson that we read in the historical geography of the New World is the history of a great man's blunder. When Columbus sailed from Palos on his first voyage of discovery, he expected to land in Cathay, or China, which had been made known to the people of Europe by Marco Polo and other travelers. Strong as was his belief that he should make such a landfall, he found nothing in the islands which he discovered corresponding to the glowing accounts of Cathay that he had received. Hence he concluded that he had come upon some of the islands that Marco had described as lying off the eastern coast of Asia, and so that he was within the magic circle of India. For example, he identified Hayti as Cipango, or Japan. He therefore reported on his return to Spain that he had found the Indias, and, of course, the Indians. In his three subsequent voyages he interpreted everything that he discovered in the light of his original prepossession. He believed that Cuba and the South American coast were parts of the mainland of Asia; and although he was twice on the shore of the new continent, and followed it for some distance in both instances, he never entertained the idea that he had found a new world. He said, not long before his death, that if any man did not give him credit for having discovered the remaining parts of Asia, it must spring from personal hostility. His report was implicitly accepted by the Spanish Government, which proceeded in due time to organize the famous Council for the Indies. The example that the Spaniards thus set was generally followed. Columbus's geographical errors were in due time corrected, but the correction did not prevent the names Indies and Indians from attaching themselves firmly to the New World. The islands among which he made his first discoveries are still known as Indies, the prefix West having been given them to distinguish them from the Indies proper, or, as they are now called, the East Indies. All things considered, it is perhaps

strange that the whole New World was not similarly named ; at least, The Indies is the Spanish official designation of America to this day. But while the name that Columbus applied to the new countries is now used only in a restricted sense, the name that he applied to the people is used in a general sense. The native races of America are known as the Indians, or the American Indians, to distinguish them from the Asiatic or original Indians. As a result, wherever the word "Indian" is used as a local name, either by itself or in combination, we have a memorial of the erroneous theory that lay in the mind of Columbus when he sailed from Palos, and of the practical mistakes that he committed afterward, and in which he persisted to his death.*

A thousand times has the failure to call by his name the world to which Columbus piloted the way been declared a grievous wrong. Had such a suggestion been made to him, he would have repelled it with passionate warmth. He had brooded on Asia, he sailed for Asia, his great plans turned on Asia, and it was Asia that he had found. To listen to anything else would have been treason to the passion of his life. He had sought what he did not find ; he had found what he did not seek. We know that his failure was a far grander triumph than his success could have been, but this thought lay below the horizon of his day. But we must not think Columbus blinder than others. Asia had completely enthralled the men of that age, and they could see no other vision when they looked into the West. History is full of

* Dr. George E. Ellis says : "It is to be noted, however, that the French, who so soon after followed the Spaniards by voyages to the southern and northern lands on the mainland of our domain, did not adopt or use the word 'Indians' as a name for the aborigines. I do not recall a single case of its use by any of the French explorers. They uniformly spoke and wrote of the natives as '*les sauvages*'—the savages. Occasionally a reference may be found in which a French writer will use the expression, 'the Indians, as the English call the *savages*.'"—*The Red Man and the White Man*, p. 3.

examples, including both the Cabots and explorers as late as John Smith, Henry Hudson, and La Salle. John Cabot thought that he had landed in the territory of the Grand Khan when he made his landfall in the region of the St. Lawrence. Thoroughly to cast Asia out of the map of the Western Hemisphere was the work of two hundred years.

Americus Vespucius was long supposed to have robbed Columbus of the honor that was his due. This is now known to be a baseless charge. Without attempting to guess the Vespucian riddle, which is, perhaps, the most perplexing in the history of Western exploration, the main facts in relation to the baptism of the New World may be stated.

In April or May, 1503, Vespucius wrote a letter to Lorenzo de Medici, giving an account of his voyage in 1501-'2, the so-called third of the Vespucian voyages, in which he had followed the South American coast far to the south of Cape San Roque. He thought it proper to call this coast a new world. The translator of a Latin version of this letter that appeared at the beginning of the next year made these words the title of his little pamphlet, *Mundus Novus*. Numerous editions of this tract were published in different languages, and among others the Latin edition referred to at Strasburg, in 1505. In September, 1504, Vespucius wrote a letter to Soderini, a magistrate of Florence and an old schoolfellow, in which he gave a rough outline of his four voyages. This letter was published in Florence, July, 1506.

At this time there was a small group of scholars, sometimes called an academy or college, clustered around a printing press in Saint Dié, in the Vosges Mountains. While these scholars were employed upon a new edition of Ptolemy's Geography, there was brought to them a French copy of Vespucius's letter to Soderini, which was handed over to Martin Waldseemüller and Matthias Ringman, who were more especially charged with the work, to be used as material. Ringman was the man who had brought out the Strasburg edition of the letter to Lorenzo, and was therefore

already familiar with the idea of a new world. Too impatient to await the tardy appearance of the Ptolemy, the two scholars executed a work named *Cosmographiæ Introductio*. This work, consisting of fifty-two leaves, contained a simple treatise on cosmography and the full text of the letter to Soderini. The last chapter of the original part of the work, following descriptions of Asia, Europe, and Africa as the three grand divisions of the earth, as taught by Ptolemy, contained this pregnant sentence :

“But now these parts have been more extensively explored, and another fourth part has been discovered by Americus Vespucius, as will appear in what follows : wherefore I do not see what is rightly to hinder us from calling it Amerige or America, i. e., the land of Americus, after its discoverer Americus, a man of sagacious mind, since both Europe and Asia have got their names from women.”

The *Cosmographiæ Introductio* was published in 1507, and attained a considerable circulation. Its principal author, Waldseemüller, baptized America. We must not suppose that the Saint Dié scholar dreamed of what he was doing. He intended merely to call a part of the country that we know as Brazil, America. The name was soon expanded. On John Ruysch's map of 1508, so much of South America as appears is called *Terra Sanctæ Crucis, sive Mundus Novus*, while the discoveries that had already been made in the north are represented as appendages of Asia. On the map assigned to Leonardo da Vinci (about 1514) America takes the place of this double designation, and on Mercator's Projection (1541) Labrador, Nova Scotia, Florida, Mexico, and *Mundus Novus* are connected by continuous though very inaccurate coast lines, making a continent wholly distinct and separate from Asia, while, as if to solemnize the marriage, the first three letters of the name AMERICA, now given to the whole continent, are placed above the site of Lake Superior, and the last four west of the River Plate.

Still Columbus's name has been many times impressed on the map of the New World ; witness the United States of

Colombia, the District of Columbia, the capitals of South Carolina and Ohio, the great river of Oregon, and the minor Columbuses and Columbias scattered over our land. Then the poetic name sometimes given to America, but commonly to the United States, should not be forgotten. Its earliest use in literature, in the more limited sense, is said to be in Dr. Dwight's song :

Columbia, Columbia, to glory arise,
The queen of the world and the child of the skies.

The land that Vespucci called *Novus Mundus* and Waldseemüller *America*, was first called *Sancta Cruz*, and afterward *Terra Sanctæ Crucis*. *America* was soon used for a general purpose, while the earlier names gave way to *Brazil*, a name given to the country because it produced Brazil wood, a highly prized dye stuff, so called on account of its color—*brazza*, a live coal or glowing fire. The same name, variously spelled, had before been applied to a mythical island lying in the Atlantic. Mr. Scaife says the name had "a will-o'-the-wisp character," since it designated various bodies of land on different maps, as an antarctic continent extending to the south pole, as well as the island of Brazil, which the map-makers moved about to suit themselves. The mythical geography of the Atlantic Ocean contributed another notable name to American history. *Antillia*, or *Isle of Seven Cities*, one of the most persistent of the imaginary islands, was supposed to lie in mid-ocean on the road to Cathay. Toscanelli, who figured it on his celebrated map, told Columbus that it would be a convenient halfway house on his great voyage to the Indies. Early in the sixteenth century the name was given to the groups of islands that still bear it—the Greater and the Lesser Antilles.

India and Indian are not the only American names that commemorate blunders. The body of water called *Rio Janeiro* is a bay, and not a river; the *Rio de la Plata* is not a river of silver. The name of the greatest river on the globe was given to it in the belief that its banks were inhabited by

a tribe of female warriors, and so it keeps alive the Amazons who figure in ancient story. On the St. Lawrence, not far above Montreal, the village of Lachine stands at the foot of the rapids of the same name. Mr. Parkman quotes an old French authority, who says that the name was given to the place in 1669 by some of La Salle's men, who refused longer to follow him, in derision of the adventurer's dream of a westward passage to China. Another account is that La Salle himself gave the name, in token of his early faith that he could reach China by the way of the St. Lawrence. Mention may also be made of the coast that was early called *Tierra del Labrador*, cultivable land, to distinguish the region, it is said, from Greenland.

Two nations that shared in the division of America wrote their religious creeds on the maps of the regions that they visited and for a time controlled. For example, we find in Canada, the Lake region, and the Mississippi Valley many rivers named for saints: the St. Croix, the St. Johns, the St. Lawrence, the St. Francis, the St. Charles, St. Maurice, St. Claire, St. Josephs, St. Louis, and many others. In Florida the St. Marys and the St. Johns are found. Between Nova Scotia and Florida, with a single exception, I recall no river that bears the name of a saint. The French who named the rivers of the North and West, and the Spaniards who named those of the South, were Catholics, while the English who occupied the middle region were Protestants. The exception proves the rule—it is the St. Marys of Maryland, a Catholic colony. The geographical distribution of towns and cities bearing the prefix "St.," "San," or "Santa," is also well worth observing. In fact, from the day that Columbus called Guanahani San Salvador, the Spaniards, Portuguese, and French gave full proof of their piety by drawing heavily upon the saints' calendar and the list of holy days to mark their discoveries.

A small island off the western coast of Newfoundland is called Baccalaos. This word is extensively used in southern Europe as a name for codfish. It has the same mean-

ing as stock-fish, so called because this fish was commonly stuck on a stock or stick to be cured. Baccalaos, variously spelled, is found on many of the maps of the early discoverers on the eastern coast of North America. Sometimes it is the name of an island, sometimes of an extensive region on the mainland, sometimes it comprehends Newfoundland, Labrador, and Nova Scotia. Who first used the name can not be ascertained, but the causes that led to its use are clear enough. At that time, when all Christians were Catholics and the Catholic festivals were universally observed, fish were a very important article of food and fishing a very important industry; and it was but natural that the name "codfish land" should be given to the region where, as the Cabots said, these fish almost crowded one another out of the water.

A full list of names once placed on maps of America that did not remain there would be a long one. Peru was called New Castile. Sir Francis Drake, on his voyage around the world in 1577-'80, visited the western shore of the United States, took possession of it in the name of Queen Elizabeth, and named it Nova Albion. The same name was given to New Jersey, when it was patented to Edward Plowden in 1634. Around few of our lost names does more romance cluster than around Norumbega. This name, variously spelled, is found on many early maps, sometimes designating an island off the coast south of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and sometimes a part of the mainland. We read also of a river and city bearing the same name; the river is supposed to have been the Penobscot, the city was never found. In the day when the discovery of gold was an almost universal passion, when fancy was quick and men were credulous, it was not strange that crazy adventurers, misinterpreting what the Indians told them, should invent an El Dorado; while of all possible regions the vast wilds of the Orinoco or the Amazon were the most favorable for its location. On no other subject did the Spaniards so often misunderstand the Indians as in relation to the precious

metals. Efforts to find the gold and silver of Manoa, culminating in those made by Sir Walter Raleigh at the beginning of the seventeenth century, yield to few adventures in respect to romance and peril, and to none in respect to the disappointments with which they were crowned. The fictions of the El Dorado and of the Amazons originated at the same time. Basing her claim upon Verrazzano's voyage of 1524, France at one time claimed the eastern sea front of the United States, and her attempt to colonize and hold the southern portion of it led to some of the most tragical events in colonial history. Two important marks of that temporary occupation still remain, the names Port Royal and Carolina, the second of which was given for Charles IX of France. In accordance with the same claim, Henry IV gave the region bounded on the south by the fortieth parallel, and on the north by the forty-sixth parallel, to De Monts, the charter bearing the date 1603. The king imposed upon the grant the name Acadia. The establishment of the English colonies and other causes soon limited the name to the peninsula that the English afterward named Nova Scotia. Acadia has disappeared from the map, but will long live in history, and in tale and story.

California is perhaps the most romantic of all our American names. In 1862 Dr. E. E. Hale found the name in a Spanish romance that appeared in 1510, entitled *The Deeds of Esplandian*. In this romance this bit of description is met with :

Know, then, that on the right hand of the Indies there is an island called California, very close to the side of the Terrestrial Paradise, and it was peopled by black women, without any men among them, for they lived in the fashion of Amazons. They were of strong and hearty bodies, of ardent courage and great force. Their island was the strongest in all the world, with its steep cliffs and rocky shores. Their arms were all of gold, and so was the harness of the wild beasts which they tamed and rode. For in the whole island there was no metal but gold. They lived in caves wrought out of the

rock with much labor. They had many ships with which they sailed out to other countries to obtain booty.*

The connection between this romance and the western side of our continent has not been very clearly made out. Dr. Hale thought the name struck the fancy of Cortez as an omen of wealth, and that he made the application in 1530 ; as a Western person now gives the name of Eden to his new home, so Cortez called his new discovery California. This is probable enough as to the process, but doubtful as to the man and the time. The name is a striking one, derived perhaps from the Eastern title caliph, and it does not require much ingenuity to see how such adventurers as the Spaniards should have borrowed it from the romance.† Certain it is that the name became greatly expanded ; there came to be an Upper and a Lower California, the first of which is now the State of that name, while the second is still a province of Mexico. For many years following the discovery of gold California was often called El Dorado : this was because that golden name had come to be a synonym for a place where it was believed wealth could be rapidly accumulated.

Of the familiar process of name expansion the New World offers some good examples. America and Brazil have already been mentioned. When the Spaniards invaded the country of Montezuma they found that his capital and the district surrounding it were called Mexico, a name derived from the Aztec war god. This name the Spaniards gave to the whole country, and afterward to a large share of Spanish North America. The first use of Canada, as well as its origin, is disputed ; some writers derive it from a Latin root, some say it is a native word ; some hold that it was first a generic name, and some that it was a local name ; the probability is that the name is Indian, meaning a village or collection of huts, and that the early

* The Atlantic Monthly, vol. xiii, p. 267.

† See Winsor: Narrative and Critical History, vol. ii, p. 443.

French explorers, meeting it for the first time on the lower St. Lawrence, mistook it, for the name of a region or district. No one claims that the Indians, or even the French, ever used it in its present greatly enlarged signification.

In 1513, Ponce de Leon, while in search of the fountain of youth, as the story runs, discovered the southern peninsula in which the Atlantic coast terminates, and named it Florida, because he first saw the shore on Pascua Florida, or flowery Sunday, as the Spaniards call Easter. This name the Spaniards extended until "it comprehended," says Mr. Parkman, "the whole country extending from the Atlantic on the east to the longitude of New Mexico on the west, and from the Gulf of Mexico and River of Palms indefinitely northward toward the frozen sea." The same writer tells us further that a map of the time of Henry II of France names all North America Terra Florida. France and England laid claim to large parts of this territory. France finally withdrew her claim in the South, leaving the other two powers to settle their dispute. England founded the colonies of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia in spite of the opposition of Spain. The Spanish claim, and so Florida itself, was more and more hemmed in ; but no final boundary had been agreed upon down to the time that Florida was ceded to England, in 1763. Long before this time the founding of Louisiana by the French had cut Florida short on the west, at the Perdido River. The King of England, the very year of the cession, made the St. Marys River and the thirty-first parallel the northern boundary of the province. Passing by the later disputes over its boundaries, we may say that Florida came to the United States in 1819 with the limits just named, and that it was afterward somewhat reduced in order to widen Alabama's front on the Gulf of Mexico.

The first Louisiana was the Mississippi Valley, together with the country east and west draining to the Gulf of Mexico from the Perdido to the Rio Grande. The second Louisiana was the western half of the valley and the

island of New Orleans. This was the Louisiana purchase of 1803. In 1804 Congress organized that part of the purchase lying south of parallel 33° into the Territory of Orleans, and the next year the part lying north of the same line into the Territory of Louisiana. This state of things continued until 1812, when the Territory of Orleans, with some minor changes of boundaries, became the State of Louisiana, and the Territory of Louisiana took the name of Missouri.

In choosing names of discoverers and explorers for geographical purposes, the Muse of History acted a capricious part. Her treatment of Columbus and Vespuccius has already been described. Neither of the two Cabots nor John Smith was in any way recognized. Raleigh lives in the capital of North Carolina. Hudson is commemorated by the river, the strait, and the bay that bear his name. Champlain gave his name to the lake that he discovered in 1609, but none of the other great French discoverers has been equally honored—neither Verrazzano nor Cartier, La Salle nor Hennepin. Marquette is the name of a city in Michigan, and Joliet of one in Illinois. In the far North, where competition for territory was less eager, it is somewhat different; here we meet the names of Frobisher, Davis, Baffin, and Smith. The great Spanish discoverers and conquerors fared still worse than the Englishmen and Frenchmen; the names of Ponce de Leon, De Soto, Cortes, Coronado are unknown to the maps unless in humble capacities. In later times it has been much as it was in the beginning: Mackenzie, Lewis, Clark, Pike, Long, Fremont, are familiar names of mountains or rivers; but we search in vain for any token of the brothers La Verendrye, who discovered the Rocky Mountains; of Gray, who first sailed into the mouth of the Columbia; or of Bonneville, who first explored the Great Basin.

A glance at a map of the New World would teach any student, independently of other evidence, that it had been in possession of a native race or races before the arrival of the European colonists. There is no mistaking an aboriginal

name for a European one. The Indian names that remain throw light upon the distribution and relationships of the native tribes, upon their habits of mind, and the scope of their geographical ideas. They illustrate the tendency to name an object with reference to some striking quality or feature. Minnehaha is laughing water ; Sandusky, cold spring ; Michilimackinac, great-turtle place. The Indians of the north, at least, were deficient in general names, as of regions and districts ; even our States that bear Indian names have borrowed them from local features, as the name of a river or of an Indian tribe. As in Europe, the most persistent names are those of rivers. A large majority of the important rivers of the United States bear Indian names, and particularly those of the West, some of which have survived a close competition with one or more European names. The Spaniards first called the Mississippi the river of the Holy Spirit ; Marquette called it the Immaculate Conception, and La Salle the Colbert ; the Iroquois called it the Ohio ; but the proper Algonquin name, Mississippi, meaning "much water" or "many waters," was the fittest, if survival is a test of fitness. The French called the Ohio both the St. Louis and the La Belle Rivière, but here again the native name triumphed. Cartier adopted the Indian name Hochelaga for the great river of the north, but St. Lawrence, the name that he had given to the gulf, unfortunately superseded it. The same river is called the Iroquois and the Cataraqui in many old historical documents.

It is a significant fact that, relatively, a much larger number of native names has been preserved in the West than in the East. Only two of the fifteen Atlantic States bear such names, while only five of the twenty-nine other States bear European names. Something the same is true also of rivers and other natural features of the country. White men suddenly introduced to the Atlantic slope tended to use European names ; while in the West, where they became acquainted with the country gradually, they tended to use a larger number of the native names.

The nations colonizing America would naturally want names for their new possessions, and just as naturally they would tend to name them after the old countries. Spain was content with The Indies as a general name ; but she called her vast dominions in North America, exclusive of Florida, New Spain, a name that remained on the map until those dominions became independent. On Franquelin's map, such of Louis XIV's American dominions as drained to the Atlantic, the St. Lawrence, and the Great Lakes are called New France ; such of them as drained to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana. At a later day New France included both of these two great divisions, while the divisions themselves were called Louisiana and Canada.* The Swedes called their colony on the Delaware New Sweden, and the Dutch their more vigorous plantings New Netherlands. New England was never used in a general sense. In one respect England's possessions in North America were peculiar ; they never had any proper general name. The nearest approach to it was Virginia.

The Cabots did not name the coasts visited by them in 1497-'98, that England afterward claimed by right of their discoveries. The charter granted to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584 neither named nor described any region that he was authorized to colonize. Raleigh proposed to call the country to which he sent his ships Virginia, in honor of the Virgin Queen, and Elizabeth promptly approved the suggestion. The charter of 1606, that created the London and Plymouth Companies, authorized the planting of two colonies in that part of America commonly called Virginia, and other parts and territories lying between 34° and 45° north latitude. The charter of 1609 to the London Company

* "According to Ortilius, New France comprises the whole of both North and South America ; so also in the *Speculum Orbis Terrarum* of Cornelius, 1593. The application of this name dated back to a period immediately after the voyage of Verrazzano, and the Dutch geographers are especially free in their use of it, out of spite of the Spaniards."—*Parkman : Pioneers of France in the New World*, p. 184.

bounded Virginia on the south by a latitudinal line drawn through a point two hundred miles south of Old Point Comfort, and north by a west and northwest line drawn through a point the same distance from the same starting place, "throughout from sea to sea." The charter of 1611-'12 made the Bermudas a part of Virginia.

These vast limits were invaded on every side. The Maryland and Pennsylvania charters, 1632 and 1681, with the subsequent settlements, limited the colony on the north by the Potomac River and Mason and Dixon's line; the Carolina charter of 1665, limited it on the south by the parallel $36^{\circ} 30'$. The treaties made in 1763, at the close of the French and Indian War, bounded the English colonies on the west, Virginia included, by the Mississippi River. At the close of the Revolution Virginia claimed on the parallel $36^{\circ} 30'$ to the Mississippi, and northwest of the Ohio to the Great Lakes and the same river. In 1784 she surrendered to the National Government her claim to the Old Northwest, and in 1792 she consented to the admission of Kentucky to the Union as an independent State. The Civil War still further limited the State of Virginia by the creation of West Virginia.

In 1608 Captain John Smith explored more fully than had yet been done the coast of northern Virginia beyond Cape Cod, mapped it, and named it New England. The charter of 1620 confirmed to the Plymouth Company all that part of America lying between the fortieth and the forty-eighth parallels of north latitude, "throughout all the mainlands from sea to sea," King James at the same time declaring it to be his will and pleasure that the same should henceforth be called by the name of New England in America. This great domain was cut short in the north by the French claims and settlements, and on the west and southwest by the operations of the Dutch on the Hudson and the creation of the group of middle colonies.

At first Englishmen called the new English communities beyond the Atlantic The Colonies, or The Plantations, and afterward, when circumstances required more precision,

The Thirteen Colonies, or The American Colonies. When these communities became independent, and assumed a separate station among the nations of the earth, they took the name The United States of America. It has often been proposed that this designation, which is rather a description than a name, should be dropped, and a real name, as "Columbia," "Appalachia," or "Alleghania," should be adopted in its stead.

There is not a State in the Union a good map of which will not teach some valuable historical lessons. The shower of classical names on the map of Central New York does not point to a Roman or Greek occupation of that State, but it certainly was not an accident. The large number of places in Virginia marked "C. H.," with the name of the county preceding the letters, as Hanover Court House, Fairfax Court House, Cumberland Court House, etc., point plainly enough to the infrequency of towns that was so characteristic of that State in early times.* The names of Gallia County and Gallipolis, Ohio, testify to the French emigration that the Scioto Company, under the lead of Joel Barlow, brought to the banks of the Ohio. Cincinnati was named for the famous Revolutionary society of the Cincinnati, and points us back to the Roman dictator. The map of Michigan bears impartial testimony to the presence of the races and nationalities that have dominated the two peninsulas, the Indian, the French, and the Anglo-American. In the south-central and southwestern portions of the State many counties are known by the names of President Jackson and leading Democratic statesmen of his time—Calhoun, Van Buren,

* "One great element of modern life was wholly wanting. There were practically no towns and no centers of population. The people were widely scattered over the whole face of the country. . . . These [county] towns, planted in many cases in the midst of the forest, usually consisted of the courthouse, the prison, and its accompaniments of stocks, pillory, whipping post, and ducking stool, with one miserable inn, where the judges lodged when they came to hold court."—*Lodge: A Short History of the English Colonies in America*, pp. 50, 52.

Cass, Livingston, Berrien, Branch, Eaton, and Barry. Not a single Whig statesman has been similarly honored. The explanation is that the State came into the Union under Democratic auspices, in 1837, and was itself strongly Democratic in politics at the time when this portion of the State was settled.

Why some names survive and others perish, is a curious question. Professor E. G. Bourne draws attention to the fact that Waldseemüller really proposed two names for the *Novus Mundus* of Vespucci—*Amerige*, composed of the Greek *ge* and a shortened genitive of *Americus*, and a feminine form of *Americus*; and he thinks the second one was adopted rather than the first because it is simpler and more euphonious.* No doubt the superior fitness or convenience of one name rather than another was often a decisive factor. Political causes also had much to do with the matter. The triumph of England over France effaced New France and Acadia from the map, while the independence of Mexico abolished New Spain.

Still closer attention may be drawn to the relations existing between names and nationalities. The traces of the French in South Carolina, on Lake Champlain, in the West, and on the northern New England shore are too obvious to be mistaken. It is not necessary to read history to learn that the Dutch, the first of Europeans, occupied the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys, New York Bay, and parts of New Jersey. At the close of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the succeeding one, thousands of Scotch-Irish flocked to America; and their names may be found scattered along our great Eastern mountain system from Londonderry in New Hampshire to the far South. Holland, and several other names of Netherland provinces found on the western shore of the lower Michigan peninsula, enable us to locate a large Dutch emigration. Historical geography teaches us that a large part of the United States once belonged to

* The Nation, No. 1423.

Spain ; for example, little learning is required to distinguish between the river names of Texas or California and those of the Atlantic slope.

One of the most important lessons read in our historical geography is the great number of Old World names found on our maps. These names teach us how much easier it is to borrow an old name than to make a new one. They establish lines of race descent and of historical connection. They speak of the emigrant's fondness for the places and scenes and men that he has left behind him. Very often we find a name that has been many times repeated ; perhaps it was first used in Massachusetts, then transported to Western New York or to Ohio, next to Wisconsin or Iowa, and finally to the Pacific slope. The emigration that has made the last transfer looks back to its previous home, as the English emigrants to Massachusetts or Virginia looked back to the mother country. All the nationalities that have contributed to our mixed population have also contributed to our store of geographical names.

CHAPTER XV.

NORTH AMERICA IN OUTLINE.

References.—Reclus: The Earth and its Inhabitants (The United States), also other works previously mentioned; Guyot: Earth and Man; Whitney: The United States. Facts and Figures Illustrating the Physical Geography of the Country and its Material Resources; Shaler: Previous references; Ganett: A Dictionary of Altitudes in the United States; Doyle: The History of the United States, Chap. I., The English Colonies in America, I., The Puritan Colonies, II., Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas; Count of Paris: History of the Civil War in America (Vol. III., Chap. I., Rivers and Railways); Draper: History of the American Civil War, Thoughts on the Future Civil Polity of America (I., On the Influence of Climate); Thwaites, Hart, and Wilson: Epoch Series of American History; MacCoun: Historical Geography of the United States, Historical Charts of the United States.

THE teacher of history should form in his mind an outline map of the theater with which he deals,—an outline at once strong and bold, and also sufficiently detailed to hold the larger historical facts. This map will be larger or smaller according to the breadth of the field that he is covering. If he is treating the civil war in England, a map of Great Britain suffices; but if he is following the career of Napoleon, his survey must practically embrace all Europe. The teacher of the history of the United States will find it necessary to work out such a map of North America. Moreover, no small part of his task will be to develop similar maps in the minds of his pupils, and to show them how to organize their historical material with reference to them.

As an aid to teachers who are seeking to do this work, as well as a preparation for several chapters that are to follow, a mental sketch map of our continent is submitted.

In form North America bears a general likeness to a triangle. Its sides are formed by the shore lines of the three oceans that inclose it. In size it is the third of the continents, containing a little less than 8,000,000 square miles (7,952,386 square miles, including the West Indies).

The eastern north-and-south trending ranges of the Cordilleran Mountain system form the primary geographical axis of the continent, and divide it into two very different but not very unequal parts.

The western division, consisting of a vast complex of mountain ranges and peaks, valleys, basins, slopes, and plateaus, is sometimes called the Pacific Highlands, sometimes the Cordilleran System, and again the Cordilleran Region. This region is very complicated in geographical structure, even that part of it which falls within the United States being divided into six several parts: 1, The Rocky Mountains; 2, The Great Basin and the Basin ranges; 3, The Northern or Columbian Plateau; 4, The Southern or Colorado Plateau; 5, The Sierra and Cascade ranges; 6, The Pacific Coast ranges. While we are not called upon to describe these one by one, some of the more general features of the region should be worked out.

The first fact to invite our attention is the high elevation which the Pacific Highlands reach. In the United States alone there are numerous mountain peaks that attain to heights of more than fourteen thousand feet above the level of the sea. These high altitudes, however, are much less significant than the high average elevation of the whole mass. If the continent were depressed about six thousand feet—or, what amounts to the same thing, if the sea were raised by that amount—while its whole eastern side would disappear beneath the waves, on the western side, in Central America, in Mexico, in the United States, and in the British Possessions, not merely isolated mountain peaks, but

extensive plateaus and valleys would still be above the surface.

Railroads that cross mountains seek out the natural passes or depressions. The Northern Pacific Railroad pierces the divide of the Rocky Mountains, high up in William's Pass, by a tunnel four-fifths of a mile long, at an elevation of 5,548 feet. The Union Pacific Railroad, in South Pass, attains an elevation of more than eight thousand feet. The Central Pacific crosses the Sierra Nevada seven thousand feet above the sea level. Ogden, where the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific effect their junction, is forty-three hundred feet, or about the level of Salt Lake.

Another feature is the shore line ; north of Puget Sound this is irregular, but not deeply indented; south of the sound it is so remarkably regular that one rarely finds an extended coast that conforms more closely to a series of straight lines drawn from headland to headland. There are but two or three good harbors within the limits of the United States, the best ones being formed by the bays of San Francisco and San Diego. The rapid growth of San Francisco is mainly owing to its having the finest harbor on the coast. The mouth of the Columbia River is difficult of access, save to steam vessels handled by skillful pilots.

Mention of the Columbia suggests another characteristic feature ; but few rivers come down to the sea. There are but two worthy of note in the United States—the Columbia and the Colorado—and these are in no sense continental streams. No river on that side opens a water-way to the central part of the continent.

But the absence of continental rivers is not the only fact that makes the continent difficult of approach on that side. Starting from any point on the coast that one may choose, he must cross parallel chains of lofty mountains before he reaches the interior. Again, the slopes are abrupt—some of them very abrupt. The descent from the summit of the Central Pacific Railroad on the *sierra* to the great valley of California is greater than that from the South Pass to

Omaha, and is made in a much shorter distance. The locomotives that draw the heavily laden trains up the slopes of the *sierra* labor as though they were things of life.

Putting all that has been said together, we see that the western side of North America is geographically closed and unsocial. It does not stretch out open hands to the Pacific Ocean and the world beyond. Nor should we fail to observe that, until we reach a high latitude, there are no islands off the coast or near the coast that could allure the discoverer, or give the colonist a basis of operations against the continent itself. The greatest of all the oceans rolls between that shore and the ancient but stunted civilizations of the opposing one. Fortunately, the continent did not invite the Mongolian race.

Turning our backs upon the Pacific and facing the other way, we soon discover that the eastern side of the continent differs from the western in every feature that has been mentioned. It is much simpler in structure. Not only are there no mountain ranges or peaks to compare with those of the Pacific Highlands, but the average elevation is low. We face two sides of the triangle, which are broken, and often deeply broken, by numerous indentations. Here we find some of the grandest rivers in the world. And, finally, the characteristic slopes are among the longest and gentlest with which the geographer has to deal. But all these points must be worked out in detail.

Parallel with the Atlantic shore, and not a great distance from it, run the Appalachian Mountains from Point Gaspé to Alabama. This system forms the secondary axis of the continent. It consists of numerous chains or ridges, some of them practically continuous, although separated by transverse depressions, some of them parallel and separated by intervening valleys. The highest summits are Mount Washington, 6,290 feet, and the Black Dome, 6,688 feet above the level of the sea. In structure, this system of mountains is much the most complicated part of eastern North America.

To the east of the Appalachian Mountains lies the Atlantic Slope or Plain, having an average width of not more than two hundred miles, and descending gradually from the mountain foothills to the shore. This slope is indented, and sometimes cut almost wholly across by numerous bays, sounds, and arms of the sea. It is also traversed by a multitude of rivers that head in the mountains, a few of them flowing east or south, but most of them following the general line of the slope to the southeast. These ocean indentations and rivers furnish numerous harbors—many of them excellent harbors—and some of them also water transportation almost to the very watersheds that supply them.

The Atlantic slope is singularly open and accessible from the side of the sea ; but the mountains behind it, while of low elevation as compared with those of the Pacific slope, still form a mountain rampart that long opposed an effectual obstacle to westward movements of population, and even to discovery and exploration.

Between the Cordilleran and Appalachian systems of mountains lies the Central Plain or middle region of the continent. This plain extends from the Arctic Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, five thousand miles, and from east to west, in the widest part, one half that distance. The numerous inequalities that it presents, although some of them are called mountains, are so slight in comparison with the size of the region that we may well consider it as the third primary unit of the continent, the Pacific Highlands and the Atlantic Highlands being the other two.

The Central Plain is divided into three parts. The St. Lawrence Valley and the Lake Basin, which together form one of the three subdivisions, cuts the Appalachian system and the Atlantic plain short on the north, and then, extending first southwest and then north and northwest, splits the Central Plain one half in two. North of the watersheds of the St. Lawrence River and of the Great Lakes, and of the wavy slight elevation that extends westward to the Rocky Mountains, is the Arctic Plain, sloping gradually down to

the Arctic Ocean, Hudson Bay, and the Labrador coast. South of the southern watersheds of the St. Lawrence, beginning at a point in central New York, and of the elevation before referred to beyond the head of Lake Superior, and of the Great Lakes, the Mississippi Valley slopes southward to the Gulf of Mexico, by far the most important of the subdivisions of the Central Plain. Perhaps the best way to think of these three divisions is as continental drainage basins.

The comparative sizes of the various physical divisions of the United States are of much interest. The following are the areas as given by Professor Whitney, to whom I am much indebted for facts used in the preparation of this chapter, Alaska not included :

	square miles.
The Pacific slope and Great Basin	848,000
The Atlantic slope	277,000
The Lake Basin	175,000
The Mississippi Valley	1,240,000
Other Gulf of Mexico drainage	486,000
Total	<u>3,018,000</u>

The eastern side of North America lies open to the sea. Three great water-ways pierce its center.

First may be mentioned Hudson Bay and the Nelson-Winnipeg River system, which extends to the Rocky Mountains and Height of Land. The great bay, discovered by the man whose name it bears and whose life it cost, in the days when men were searching for a northwest sea route to the Indies, was once a bone of English and French contention ; but since it is closed to navigation the major part of the year it has never acquired much historical importance. Still it offers the shortest passage from the far Northwest to the wharves of Liverpool, and the practicability of sending the grain products of that extensive region by that passage to the European markets is now under discussion.

Secondly, the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes. This

water-way played an important part in the early days of discovery and exploration; and it was the object of a much fiercer contention between the great powers before mentioned than the more northern one, almost from the beginning of the French and English plantations down to 1763. In the two struggles between the United States and England the possession of the St. Lawrence has been vigorously attacked by the first and stoutly defended by the second. The basin that it drains is so large and so productive, and is so closely connected with the surrounding areas, while the St. Lawrence is itself such a noble river, that, as has been said, we might expect to find it forming the grand avenue of communication with the interior, and furnishing at or near its mouth the metropolis of the continent, were it not that the northeasterly trend of the river carries it into a region beyond that of successful cultivation and populous settlements, where navigation is suspended during a considerable portion of the year. As it is, New York is found at the opening of another inland commercial avenue.

Far in the south the Gulf of Mexico makes the largest indentation found on the eastern side of the continent. This not only gives to the United States a long sea boundary of a thousand miles and more, but, what is of still greater importance, through the numerous rivers that flow into it, and particularly the Mississippi, makes the southern half of the Central Plain as accessible by water as any similar area in the world. The great extent of "the drainage of the territory of the United States into the Gulf of Mexico naturally opens the way to a recognition of the most important fact in the topography of the country, namely, the existence of such an orographic structure as compels the waters to concentrate themselves into one great system of tributaries, coming in from the east and the west, and uniting in a main north-and-south channel."

We may now notice the elevations above the sea of a few points lying in the Lake Basin and the Mississippi Valley :

	feet.
Lake Superior	602
Lake Erie	573
Lake Ontario	247
Pittsburg	700
Lake Itasca	1,656
St. Paul	700
St. Louis	400
Cairo	300

From St. Paul to the Yellowstone River the elevation is but two feet to the mile, and the Union Pacific Railroad ascends the Platte by a gradient of five feet to the mile.

The Great Lakes call for more specific mention. A writer has remarked that the term "Basin of the Lakes" is a misnomer, for, like most fresh-water lakes, these bodies of water occupy an elevated plateau—the summit, in fact, of the vast expanse of land which spreads out between the Alleghanies and the Rocky Mountains. No large streams flow into them, and they drain limited areas. On the contrary, the Ohio, the Wabash, and other large tributaries of the Mississippi have their sources within a few miles of the lake borders, yet drain into the southern gulf; while the great rivers of British America, commencing near the lakes, have their outlets in the northern seas. The magnificent St. Lawrence alone, finding its supply in these sources, pursues its eastward way to the Atlantic. The lakes cover a water area of ninety-five thousand square miles, and drain one of one hundred and fifty thousand. They make up the largest system of deep-water inland navigation on the globe, and contain more than one half of all its fresh-water surface. How elevated is the region that they occupy, and how low the surrounding watersheds, is shown by the channels through which at different times they have discharged their floods. Once there was an outlet from Lake Michigan through the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico; also one from Lake Erie to the Gulf by the Wabash. Later there was an open drainage channel from Lake

Ontario through the Mohawk and the Hudson to New York Bay, and still later an outlet from Lake Huron *via* Lake Nipissing, French River, and the Ottawa to the St. Lawrence. Once the Hudson, Lake Champlain, and the Richelieu formed a continuous body of water. Geologically, it is only in very recent times that the present outlet through the Detroit River, the Niagara, and the St. Lawrence became the sole channel of discharge of the northern waters.

Nature could hardly have furnished easier lines of communication from any one of the three great drainage sections of the Central Plain to those adjoining, provided she were to preserve their individuality at all.

From New York Bay northward to the St. Lawrence extends a strongly marked depression of surface that cuts the Appalachian system asunder and separates New England from the Middle States. In the southern half of this depression lies the Hudson River, with New York city at its extremity ; in the northern half, the Richelieu-Champlain system, with Montreal at its extremity ; the two separated and connected by a narrow "divide," over which canal and railroad make their way with ease. The Hudson-Richelieu Valley is the most noticeable feature in both the topography and the history of the country. In the French wars, in the Revolution, in the War of 1812, it was the theater of important military operations, especially the northern half of it ; and it is certain to become such a theater again if, unhappily, the two powers that divide its possession should again become involved in war. The Iroquois Indians perfectly understood the importance of Lake Champlain. They called it "the Gate of the Country."

Again, the Hudson River offers easy means of communication from deep water to the lower lakes. The effect of the tides is felt as far up as Albany ; and here flows into the Hudson its principal tributary, the Mohawk, which leads up to the low elevations that separate the basins of Lakes Ontario and Erie from the Atlantic plain and the Mississippi Valley.

South of the Hudson are several river valleys that deeply indent the mountain mass : the Delaware, the Susquehanna, the Potomac, the James, and the Savannah. The Carolina rivers penetrate less deeply, while their mouths are muffled by sand bars and islands formed of materials washed down from above. South of the mountains a belt of land runs east and west along the Gulf Coast, uniting the Atlantic Plain with the Mississippi Valley.

Early Western emigration moved westward along four main lines of travel : 1, the Hudson-Mohawk depression, leading to the lakes ; 2, the Potomac, leading to the upper Ohio ; 3, the Valley of Virginia, and the mountain gaps at its head, leading into Tennessee and Kentucky ; 4, the zone of low land lying along the Gulf. It was by the way of the Potomac and the Valley of Virginia that emigrants first reached the Great West ; but the first canal and railroad connecting the West and tide water were constructed through the Mohawk Valley.

The natural barriers separating the Lake Basin and the Mississippi Valley are much less formidable than those that we have been considering. In Ohio the canal summits are but four hundred feet above Lake Erie ; in Indiana the water partings are still lower ; while in early days boatmen, in times of high water, sometimes poled rafts and flat-bottomed boats from Lake Michigan to the Des Plaines and Illinois Rivers. In Wisconsin and Minnesota the portages are frequent and easy, and boats may still be pushed from the Minnesota into the Red River of the North.

Perhaps the easy transits between the four great drainage areas can be presented still more strongly. So complete is the break made by the Hudson-Mohawk system in the mountain wall that a sinking of land to an amount of only about one hundred and fifty feet would isolate from the rest of the continent all of New England and that part of Canada lying to the southeast of the St. Lawrence as far as the extremity of Gaspé. A further sinking of two hundred and eighty feet would open a water-way from the Atlantic to the Great

Lakes, and leave the mass of the Adirondacks as an island lying adjacent to New England on the east and the Appalachian land mass on the south. A depression of five hundred feet would cause the Gulf of Mexico to set back to Cincinnati and Burlington, and almost to Chicago and Jefferson City. A depression of one thousand feet would unite the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico; and one of two thousand feet would overwhelm all the watersheds east of the Rocky Mountains except the upper parts of the Appalachians, and probably the Laurentian Hills.

The eastern side of North America is its open and approachable side. The Atlantic, as compared with the Pacific, is a narrow ocean. Moreover, off the shore are numerous islands that not only held out their own attractions to navigators and planters two and a half centuries ago, but also afforded them convenient resting places on their way to the mainland: Newfoundland, the Bermudas, the Bahamas, and the Antilles.

It would be hard to exaggerate the historical consequence of the facts that have been set forth. They furnish the explanation, in so far as natural facts ever explain such things, of many interesting matters of history. They help to explain the all-important fact that North America became a historical dependency of Europe, and not of Asia. They throw a flood of light upon the first division of the continent among Spain, England, and France, on the course and order of discovery and exploration, and on the struggles of those powers for territorial dominion. They account for the extraordinary territorial expansion of the United States and their political unity. They enable us to understand the astonishing rapidity of Western settlements, and the equally astonishing celerity with which the artificial channels of travel and trade were constructed which now bind the sections of the country together with bonds stronger than those of nature. They are the sure pledge of our future territorial and political integrity. As another has said: "Areas isolated by their natural features were, before modern methods

of transportation had practically destroyed all natural barriers, adapted to be the cradle of permanent and strong races. Europe has been in all times peculiarly divided up into such areas ; hence the multiplicity of its political divisions and the fixity of the characteristics of the separate peoples which have inhabited them. North America, on the other hand, is unfitted to be the cradle place of different peoples ; its continent is in the main a geographical unit."

Such a sketch map as the foregoing will serve the teacher as a geographical framework for the distribution of the larger facts of our history. He will need, however, to add additional features relating to climate and natural productions. He can make the map more minute when he has passed beyond general outlines and entered upon details. For example, he can place the Ohio Valley *in situ* when dealing with the French and Indian War; the Rio Grande, when teaching the war with Mexico; the Cumberland and Tennessee, in connection with the campaigns of Sherman and Grant.

Every competent teacher of American history must carry in his mind a sketch map of the continent, and he must steadily aim to develop one in the minds of his pupils; but it will not come amiss again to remind him that conspectuses, or bird's-eye views, of large subjects belong rather to the later than to the earlier stages of study.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE COLONIZATION OF NORTH AMERICA.

References.—Bancroft, Hildreth, Bryant and Gay, and Winsor: Previous references; Parkman: *Pioneers of France in the New World*, *The Jesuits in North America*, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, *The Old Régime in Canada*, *Count Frontenac and France under Louis XIV*, *A Half Century of Conflict*, *Montcalm and Wolfe*; Doyle, Thwaites, and Lodge: Previous references; Roberts: *New York*; Robinson: *Vermont*; Cooley: *Michigan*; (the last three volumes in the *Commonwealth Series*); Campbell: *Outlines of the Political History of Michigan*.

On the papal bulls and right of discovery—Fiske: *The Discovery of the New World* (Vol. I., p. 454, Vol. II., Appendix B); Winsor: *The Narrative and Critical History of America* (passim); Bourne: *Papers of the American Historical Association* (IV., 169. The history and determination of the line of demarcation established by Pope Alexander VI between the Spanish and Portuguese fields of discovery and colonization); Scaife: *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1891*, p. 103. (The development of international law as to newly discovered territory); Brown: *The Genesis of the United States* (Preface, *Introductory Sketch, 1485-1607*); Phillimore: Part III., Chap. XII.; Lieber: *Miscellaneous Writings*, Vol. II., pp. 26-28; Poore: *Charters and Constitutions*, Vol. I., p. 304; Hinsdale: *Ohio Archæological and Historical Quarterly*, December, 1888 (*The Right of Discovery*).

In the fifteenth century the Pope of Rome, as supreme arbiter of the world, assumed to be the custodian and dispenser of all heathen lands. Acting in this capacity, Nicolas V, in 1454, gave to the crown of Portugal, in perpetuity,

whatever such lands she might discover from Cape Bojador, on the African coast, eastward to and including the Indies. Upon the return of Columbus, in 1493, Alexander VI, on the application of Ferdinand and Isabella for a similar dotation in the West, issued two bulls, dated May 3 and 4, 1493, that, taken in connection with those previously issued in the interest of Portugal, had this effect: They gave to Spain all heathen lands that she had already discovered or might thereafter discover, lying west of a line drawn one hundred leagues beyond the Azores, or the Cape Verd Islands, and confirmed to Portugal all such lands lying east of that line. This division did not please King John of Portugal, and so the two powers, in 1494, entered into a treaty—commonly called the Treaty of Tordesillas, from the place where it was negotiated, but sometimes the Treaty for the Partition of the Ocean, from its subject-matter—that drew the line of demarcation three hundred and seventy leagues west of the Azores, but that did not otherwise disturb the papal arrangements. This treaty the two powers, supported by the Pope, who duly ratified it, strove earnestly to carry out. But the other Western maritime powers, disregarding the treaty and also the papal bulls, entered into the competition of discovery, and ultimately Spain and Portugal were compelled to abandon their exclusive claims and to admit France, England, and Holland to the possession of shares in the Western World. The Pope's bulls were finally abandoned, and the right of discovery became the sole ground of title. When fully developed this right embraced the following features :

1. The Christian nation that discovers a heathen land owns it to the exclusion of all other Christian nations.
2. This nation must complete its title within a reasonable time by occupying and using this land.
3. The native inhabitants are the occupants of the land only.

We are now to see how this rule was applied in making the first division of North America. While the papal bulls were set aside yet their influence was great on the course of history.

I. The Spaniards in the Gulf of Mexico.

Spain took prompt possession of the islands at the entrance of the Gulf of Mexico, and at once made them a base of operations for further discovery and colonization. In 1498 Columbus discovered the South American coast near the mouth of the Orinoco River, and in twenty years from that time Spanish discoverers had traced out, in a general way, the whole coast from that point to the Carolinas. In 1513 Ponce de Leon discovered and named the Peninsula of Florida. In 1519 Cortez began the conquest of Mexico, and in 1536 Pizarro that of Peru. In 1539 De Soto began his long march through the country north of the Gulf of Mexico, searching for a throne like that of Montezuma, and for riches like the riches of Mexico. In 1540 Coronado began his quest for the Seven Cities of Cibola. De Soto started from Tampa Bay, Coronado from the Gulf of Mexico; both explorers, who penetrated the Missouri River region before returning, were unsuccessful. Besides seating herself firmly in Mexico and in Peru, Spain established lines of communication across the continent and the Pacific Ocean, reaching to the Indies.

In the sixteenth century Spain had the best opportunity ever presented to any nation to take possession of and to hold the Mississippi Valley. She held the keys to the Gulf, from which she strove to exclude all other powers. By discovering the mouths of the rivers flowing into the Gulf, and particularly of the Mississippi, she laid a foundation for a title to the vast region lying between the Appalachian and the Cordilleran mountain systems. The portal of the Mississippi stood always open to admit her ships, and there was no European power that could prevent, or for the time wished to prevent, her completing her title by occupation. The Lake and St. Lawrence region was more accessible from the south than the Mississippi Valley was from the north, because the Mississippi has less obstruction from ice. And yet Spain did not improve her great opportunity; in fact, down

to 1682 she had done nothing toward taking possession of the country lying between the Atlantic and the Rio Grande but to found St. Augustine, in 1565, and Santa Fé, in 1582. While we congratulate ourselves on the failure of Spain to plant her civilization in the Great West, we should inquire into its causes.

These causes are few and simple. The master forces that moved the Spaniards in their American undertakings were lust for gold and silver and for political and military power. The notion that the precious metals are the only real wealth, which was then universally received, had such a hold of their minds that they despised ordinary industry and trade in comparison; and when De Soto and Coronado had failed to find what they so eagerly sought in the regions that they visited, those regions lost all immediate interest for their countrymen. Probably the men who presided over Spain's interests in the New World thought the time would come when the Mississippi would be valuable; but for the time being that river had no value in comparison with the metal-producing countries of the Aztecs and the Peruvians. Thus the mines of those countries held the richest valley in the world in pledge, first for France, but ultimately for the United States. However, another motive power must be mentioned. In the long struggle between Christianity and Mohammedanism great zeal for proselyting the infidel and the heathen had been developed among the peoples of Southern Europe. But while zeal for the conversion of the Indians was a considerable factor in Spanish exploration and colonization, still of itself it was not strong enough to carry them into the Mississippi Valley. The Spaniards cut a far more picturesque figure than the English in the pages of early American history; what they did, one has said, "was poetry in action, the knight-errantry of the Old World carried into the depths of the American wilderness"; but they lacked the substantial qualities that fitted them to receive so great a heritage as the Mississippi Valley. In truth, Spain took little interest in Florida save as its pos-

session was necessary to the mastery of the islands of the Gulf and to the control of the sea routes leading from the Spanish ports to Vera Cruz and Cartagena. St. Augustine was a bulwark of both the West Indian and the East Indian seas. This explains the vigor with which Spain drove the Huguenots out of the peninsula, and the firmness with which she resisted the advance of the English toward the Gulf of Mexico.

II. The French in the Lake and St. Lawrence Basin.

At first France claimed the whole front of the continent north of Florida, basing her claim upon Verrazzano's voyage of 1524, but in the end she abandoned the southern and central parts of it to her competitors. Her first permanent colony was Port Royal, now Annapolis, planted in 1605. But Champlain persuaded the King of France that the St. Lawrence, to which Cartier's voyages of 1534, 1535, and 1540 had given him a title, was the proper center of his American empire. So Champlain was commissioned to effect the necessary change of base, and in doing so he won the title, "Father of New France." How wisely he had judged, a general view of the ideas and motives of the French in connection with the opportunities that the St. Lawrence opened to them will show. These ideas were the glory of France, the fur trade, and the salvation of the savages. Sometimes these ideas were all embodied in the same man; but properly the discoverer, explorer, or soldier stood for political and military dominion, the hunter and trader for the Indian trade, and the priest for Indian missions.

Champlain founded Quebec in 1608. The next year he ascended the Richelieu, and discovered the lake to which he gave his name. His plan was to bring within the circle of French colonization and influence the whole region extending southward from the St. Lawrence toward the mouth of the Hudson. But, unfortunately for his purposes, he encountered a war party of the Mohawk Indians near the head of the lake; and although he defeated them in battle,

he was so impressed by the prowess that they had shown, by what he heard of the confederacy to which they belonged, and by the hostility of this confederacy toward the Indians of the north, who were his allies, that on his return to Quebec he changed his policy. Had he succeeded in his first purpose, France would have seated herself on the streams that flow to the lower lakes and the St. Lawrence, to New York, Delaware, and Chesapeake Bays, and to the Ohio River. Both General Scott and General Grant, it is said, have called this region the key to the continent east of the Mississippi. Had France seized it, we know not with what difficulty it would have been wrenched from her hand, if at all. The Indian skirmish, so far as we can tell, alone prevented this issue. Still more, this skirmish was the beginning of the long hostility of the Iroquois toward the French, which is such an important factor in our history. It is also worthy of remark that this formidable confederation owed its power to the great advantages of its position, as well as to its statesmanship and valor. Not only were its lands productive, but the Confederates could, within their own territories in central New York, launch their canoes on waters that would bear them to any point of the compass. Hence it was in great part that they were able to carry the terror of their arms to the Carolinas, the Tennessee, and the Mississippi, to the upper lakes, and the lower St. Lawrence.

Champlain's second plan was to explore and to bring within the circle of French influence the country north of the St. Lawrence. Here furs were more abundant than in the south, and the savages, who proved friendly to the French and were hostile to the Iroquois, stood in equal need of salvation.

Montreal, situated on the St. Lawrence near the mouths of the Richelieu and the Ottawa, dates from the year 1611. In 1615 Champlain ascended the Ottawa, crossed the portage to Lake Nipissing, and made his way by French River and Georgian Bay to Lake Huron. On his return to Quebec the next year he discovered Lake Ontario. The Ottawa

was the thoroughfare by which the Indians were accustomed to pass between the St. Lawrence and the upper lakes. It was comparatively free from the incursions of the Iroquois ; it lay through a friendly country, and it was much shorter than the road by the St. Lawrence and the lower lakes. Naturally, therefore, it long continued the great route by which the French passed and repassed between their posts on the St. Lawrence and the Northwest. A well-known geologist who has recently visited parts of this route says it is "exciting to see with our own eyes direct evidence that the engineers of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, when following the trail of Champlain. : . were not only paying tribute to the skill of the Indians in selecting the lowest passes from one valley to another, but were also unsuspectingly utilizing one of the most remarkable of Nature's highways."

In 1629 Brulé visited Lake Superior. In 1634 Nicolet passed through the Straits of Mackinaw and discovered Lake Michigan and Green Bay. In 1659-'60 Groseilliers and Radisson reached the country beyond the head of Lake Superior. The French first heard of Lake Erie about 1640 ; but it was not until 1669 that Joliet, on returning from Lake Superior, descended the water connection between Lake Huron and Lake Erie, and thus demonstrated the connection between the upper and the lower lakes. In 1671, Saint-Lusson, at the Sault Ste. Marie, acting in the name of Louis XIV of France, took formal possession of the lakes, rivers, and islands of the Northwest, extending to the sea in every direction. About the same time La Salle discovered the Ohio. In 1673 Marquette and Joliet, starting from Green Bay, ascended Fox River, crossed the portage, descended the Wisconsin to the Mississippi, down which they floated until they had passed the mouth of the Arkansas, and satisfied themselves that the river did not flow to the Gulf of California or to Chesapeake Bay, but to the Gulf of Mexico ; then they returned to the North by the Illinois River and Lake Michigan. In the winter of 1679-'80 La Salle ascended

the St. Josephs, crossed to the Kankakee, and paddled his way down the Illinois to Peoria Lake. Two years later the same intrepid explorer descended the Illinois and the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico. On April 9, 1682, he took possession of the Mississippi Valley, in the name of his royal master, Louis XIV. About the same time Hennepin made further discoveries in the region of the upper Mississippi. In 1742-'43 the brothers La Vérendrye, starting from the French settlements in the Winnipeg country, conducted an expedition westward, in the course of which they discovered the Rocky Mountains.*

While this bare outline sacrifices all the interest and charm of French discovery and exploration, it answers the present purpose. Never did a great opportunity of the kind fall into hands better fitted to make the most of it. No sooner had the French made their feeble beginnings on the St. Lawrence, than they pierced the center of the chain of the Great Lakes, pushed their discoveries to their farthest limits, crossed the easy portages connecting the interlocked systems of waters, and made their way to the Rocky Mountains and to the Gulf of Mexico. This they did in the short space of seventy-four years, with a powerful savage foe constantly hanging upon their flank and rear. Had such a mountain system as the Appalachian stood along the southern margin of the Lake Basin, no man can conjecture in what different lines early American history might have run.

Wherever they went the French took such pains as they thought necessary to secure and hold the country. For example, missions were established among the Hurons in 1615, at Sault Ste. Marie in 1668, at Mackinaw in 1671, and also at St. Esprit, near the head of Lake Superior, and at Green Bay. These missions answered as well the purposes of trading posts and military stations, thus illustrating the close connection of the three ideas lying at the foundation of New France.

* The southern continuation of these mountains had long been known to the Spaniards.

III. The English on the Atlantic Plain.

The English rested their claim to the Atlantic Plain on the Cabot voyages of 1497 and 1498. The evidence tends to show that Spain never claimed the country north of the forty-fourth parallel, and that England for nearly a century showed no disposition to intrude south of that line. But in 1580, on the return of Sir Francis Drake from his voyage around the world, Queen Elizabeth's government informed the King of Spain that it could not acknowledge the Spanish right to all that country, either by donation by the Pope or from their having touched here and there upon those coasts. From this time England was a strong advocate of possession or use as a factor in the right of discovery. She now entered into competition with Spain south of the 44° line. Sir Walter Raleigh's attempts to plant colonies failed, but Jamestown and Plymouth proved successful. In 1526, and again in 1570, Spain had attempted to occupy Chesapeake Bay, but fortunately failed. In 1611 a Spanish armed force hovered off Jamestown, but, learning that the settlement would probably perish of disease and famine if let alone, it sailed away without molesting the feeble colony. Progressively, England occupied the coast from Maine to Florida, Georgia, the last of the thirteen colonies, owing its existence in part to the felt need of a bulwark between the Spaniards and the Carolinas. Spain steadily resisted the southward extension of the English colonies, and no definite line of demarcation between them and Florida had been fixed down to 1763.

While the English laid a firm hand upon the Atlantic Plain, they were very slow in finding their way toward the mountains that separated them from the interior of the continent. The Virginians did not discover the Shenandoah Valley until 1716, and they did not plant a settlement on the waters flowing to the Mississippi until the middle of the eighteenth century. Englishmen bore no part or lot in the discovery and exploration of the Great West. Why did

they so long linger almost within cannon shot of the shore line? Why did they not sooner enter into the Western competition with the French?

In the first place, what the Indians called "the Endless Mountains" for a long time effectually stopped their westward progress. In dealing with this subject, Professor Shaler remarks that, although the Appalachian peaks are not of great height, their ranges are singularly continuous, and that the passes did not afford for the pioneer any natural means of passage; he must climb over the mountain ridges. Then, from Maine to Alabama the forests were dense and unbroken, while the ground north of central Pennsylvania was strewn thick with bowlders. The Appalachians' barrier of forest and mountain, he says, was almost as impassable as the Alps. In the North, the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys offered a comparatively easy path to the lower lakes, although the Mohawk is not a navigable stream, but potent causes long prevented its utilization. In the second place, the mountains served to confirm Englishmen in the opinion, which was early formed, that North America was a long but narrow island lying between two oceans. But the third cause was more powerful than both the others; it was the fundamental ideas or motives of the English colonists. England sent her cavaliers to Virginia, her Puritans to Massachusetts Bay, and these colonies became distributing centers for the whole Atlantic Plain. While different in minor particulars, the Northern and Southern colonies alike possessed the great qualities of the English character. They showed some picturesque features; they made what they could out of the Indian trade, and took a feeble interest in Indian evangelization; but they were interested in industrial, commercial, and political life; they created farms and plantations, founded villages and towns, built ships in which they carried on deep-sea fisheries or sent their products to Europe or the West Indies, and, above all, established free commonwealths on the English model. Englishmen had been much less affected than the Spaniards and Frenchmen

by the Mohammedan conflict; they were already beginning to break up into a diversity of churches and sects, and so it was perfectly natural that the characteristic religious feature of the English colonies was not zeal for the souls of the Indians, but zeal for religious freedom and the rights of conscience for themselves, as in New England and Maryland. While the life of the New England villagers, the New York and Pennsylvania farmers, and the Virginia planters was tame and prosaic as compared with the life of New France or of New Spain, it was stronger, more modern, more permanent, having the promise of the future of the continent. Mr. Lowell tells us that, "looked at on the outside, New England history is dry and unpicturesque. There is no rustle of silks, no waving of plumes, no clink of golden spurs. Our sympathies are not awakened by the changeful destinies, the rise and fall of great families, whose doom is in their blood. Instead of all this, we have the homespun fates of Cephas and Prudence repeated in an infinite series of peaceable sameness, and finding space enough for record in the family Bible; we have the noise of axe and hammer and saw, an apotheosis of dogged work, where, reversing the fairy tale, nothing is left to luck, and, if there be any poetry, it is something that can not be helped—the waste of the water over the dam." And it was New England that bore the brunt of the long struggle with New France.

IV. The French and the English Colonies in Contrast.

It is very pertinent to observe that the three regions now described harmonized well with the character of the three nationalities to which they severally fell, and tended to foster their ruling ideas. The Spaniard found what he sought in the South, the Frenchman in the North, while the Englishman possessed the environment that best suited him on the Atlantic Plain. History would have run in quite different lines if the three regions had been differently distributed. In respect to the French and the Eng-

lish colonies the parallel should be traced a little distance.

How advantageous the French position was for carrying on exploration, the fur trade, and Indian missions we have seen already. The opportunities of the French developed resource, capacity for dealing with the savages, hardihood and romance, but they did not develop either a numerous people or a strong state. New France was founded by commercial companies, but it soon passed into the hands of the Crown. Planted by power and nourished by patronage, it never became self-sufficing, but always continued a tax upon the mother country. Both the virtues and the vices of absolutism flourished : courage, devotion, and chivalry ; ignorance, corruption, and dependence. The population increased very slowly, and was thinly scattered through vast wildernesses, where much of its strength was lost. Even the St. Lawrence settlements were few, small, and widely separated. Such were the attractions of the woods and the waters for the Canadians that large numbers of them adopted a forest life much like that of the Indians—becoming hunters, or *coureurs de bois*—thus adding to the picturesqueness of Canada, but also constantly draining away its life-blood. These tendencies were further stimulated by facts yet to be mentioned.

In respect to regular and productive industry, the French colonists were at a disadvantage as compared with their English competitors. In marking the contrast Professor Shaler states the following points :

1. The rapids of the St. Lawrence, the cataract of Niagara, and the storms of the Great Lakes which have few natural harbors, and, moreover, the cold that closes up these bodies of water five months of every year, were a decided drawback to the advantages that the great Northern water-way would otherwise have offered.

2. The long and severe winters, which limited the time that could be given to tillage, and made the keeping of domestic animals difficult, were a great hindrance.

3. The soil of Canada consisted of drift, and could be fitted for tillage only by a great amount of labor. To clear away the stones, to say nothing of cutting away the forests, was a costly process. Then the St. Lawrence lands were far inferior in quality to those farther south.

4. The French beginnings lay north of the corn-producing region, so that the people were without that cheap and nutritious food. At the South this grain and its universal concomitant long furnished the food staples. "Maize fields, with pumpkin vines in the interstices of the plants, became for many years the prevailing, indeed almost the only, crop throughout the northern part of America. It is hardly too much to say that, but for these American plants and the American method of tilling them, it would have been decidedly more difficult to have fixed the early colonies on this shore."

5. Tobacco, which did so much to enrich some of the English colonies, could not be produced at the North as an article of commerce. Nor was there any other agricultural staple that could take its place.

These hard conditions constantly tended to retard the increase of population, and also to disperse such as there was on the shores where fish could be caught, or in the wilderness where beaver could be trapped. The result was that Canada grew up as weak in industrial, commercial, and civic qualities as she was strong in military qualities and in adventure. A great community could not be founded on the fur trade.

On the Atlantic Plain some of the obstacles that the French encountered were also present. In the North the climate was severe, the drift extended as far south as central Pennsylvania, while the forests were heavy. Still, on the whole, all the forces that were at work tended in directions just the opposite of those that have been traced out: geographical environment, the possibilities of agriculture and trade, the opportunities for commerce, fear of the Indians

and the French, and the character of the people. Population, instead of spreading into the interior, was confined to the shore, where it became relatively numerous and thick, rich and prosperous. There were no English posts like the missions of Sault Ste. Marie and St. Esprit, no class like the *coureurs de bois*. Hunters and Indian fighters of the type of Boone and Kenton, Wetzel and Brady, did not appear until the Endless Mountains had been passed. After remarking that the proselyting spirit was far weaker in England than on the Continent, while the commercial spirit was far stronger, Professor Shaler says the English colonies in the New World "consisted of people who came to stay, to breed upon the ground, and to found New Englands on the foreign shore. Though in part led by religious convictions, seeking a haven for peculiar creeds, they were on the whole commercially minded—true colonists in their intent, as were the Greeks in their time, or their ruder imitators, the Northmen, in a later age." The causes that have been mentioned confined the English colonists between the mountains and the sea until, by reason of their growth, strength, and civic education, they had prepared themselves to contest the possession of the Great West, first with France and afterward with England and Spain. Professor Shaler has well said :

There was a certain advantage arising from the hemming in of the British colonies in North America by the Appalachian boundary. In place of the detached settlements which characterized the Spanish, and more particularly the French plantations, the British colonial establishments were, by their geographical conditions, compelled to develop in a more connected way. It was possible in 1700 to ride from Portland, Me., to southern Virginia, sleeping each night in some considerable village. If our ancestors on the continent had secured a ready access to the interior, it is likely that a hundred years [more] would have gone by before the colonists became sufficiently dense in population to permit the interactive life which prepared the way for the American Revolution.

There could be no better test of the meaning of New France and of the meaning of the English colonies than is furnished by the statistics of their population. In 1754 all New France contained 80,000 white inhabitants, the thirteen English colonies 1,160,000. The disparity in wealth must have been even greater.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN NORTH AMERICA.

References.—Bancroft, Hildreth, Bryant and Gay, Winsor, Parkman, Campbell, Roberts, Robinson, and Cooley: Previous references; Fernow: The Ohio Valley in Colonial Days; Fiske: American Political Ideas, pp. 54-56, 125; Chalmers: A Collection of Treaties between Great Britain and other Powers.

On the subjects treated in Chaps. XIV.-XVIII., inclusive, the author refers to his own work, entitled The Old Northwest, with a View of the Thirteen Colonies as constituted by the Royal Charters (I. North America in Outline; II. The First Division of North America; III. The French discover the Northwest; IV. The French colonize the Northwest; V. England wrests the Northwest from France; VI.-VII. The Thirteen Colonies as constituted by the Royal Charters; IX. The Northwest in the Revolution; X. The United States wrest the Northwest from England).

THIS struggle was a necessary outgrowth of causes that lie upon the surface. First, the character and interests of the two nations were so diverse that only an occasion was necessary to bring them into armed collision; Second, the maritime discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries greatly multiplied their points of friction; Third, the opposite tendencies and characters of the French and the English colonies in America, and, fourthly, their geographical relations, made lasting peace between them impossible. Some leading features of the long struggle will be passed in review.

Argall's exploits at Mount Desert and Port Royal in 1612,

and Kirk's capture of Quebec in 1629, require nothing more than mention. Before the next trial of arms the governors of Canada had formed the policy that they pursued to the end, and that must be briefly described.

Champlain hoped that the St. Lawrence might prove a road to China, and La Salle for a time saw the same vision. But on the discovery of the Mississippi, and of its general relations to the Lake Basin, to the Atlantic Plain, and the Gulf of Mexico, La Salle conceived a new plan. This was to make the Mississippi the center of New France, with one flank resting on the Gulf of Mexico and the other on the Gulf of St. Lawrence. These extreme points should be bound together by a chain of settlements and posts stretching through the intervening wilderness. If France could hold the two keys to the interior of the continent and could securely bind them together, she could shut the Spaniards up in Mexico and confine the English to their narrow shore. To carry out this plan it was necessary to bring the Indians of the West within the circle of French influence, and, since the Iroquois could not be placated, to break their power. Such was the scheme that finally brought England and France into conflict in the Ohio Valley and on Lake Ontario.

England claimed the whole breadth of the continent from Maine to Georgia, but she took no steps to complete her title. She had, in fact, no colonial policy, and long trusted her interests to the logic of events. As early as 1685 Governor Dongan, of New York, divined the French policy and strove to frustrate it. He proposed that the English should penetrate the Northwest by the Mohawk Valley and Lake Erie, and thus inclose the French in the St. Lawrence Basin. In 1686 and 1687 parties of English and Dutch traders, escorted by Iroquois warriors, attempted to ascend to the upper lakes; but the French, although it was a time of peace, seized them or turned them back homeward. Soon afterward the French closed the passage from the lower to the upper lakes. Moreover, the Iroquois did not kindly

brook the intrusion even of their friends within their territories. Thus, the French and the Iroquois stopped the English at the North quite as effectually as the mountains stopped them at the South. Still, it must be said that about this time originated the claim that the Five Nations were subjects of England, and so under her protection—a claim out of which great results afterward grew. The commission of Andros, who succeeded Dongan as Governor of New York, embraced the whole country reaching to the Pacific Ocean.

Warlike operations in the time of Argall and Kirk were necessarily confined to the water. King William's War, (1689-'97) reveals some new features. The French and Indians, moving along the water courses and through the defiles of the wilderness, for the first time fell upon and destroyed outlying English settlements.* The New England colonies and New York attempted to dispatch a feeble force against Montreal, but it did not go beyond the head of Lake Champlain. A French expedition projected against Albany and New York also came to nothing. Thus early did the rival colonies find the great cleft of the mountain

* Mr. R. E. Robinson, author of *Vermont*, in the *Commonwealth Series*, has graphically described the northern highway of war. "Different routes were taken by the predatory bands in their descents upon the frontiers of New England. One was by the St. Francis River and Lake Memphremagog, thence to the Passumpsic, and down that river to the Connecticut, that gave an easy route to the settlements. Another was up the Winooski and down White River to the Connecticut. Another left Lake Champlain at the mouth of Great Otter Creek; then up its slow lower reaches to where it becomes a swift mountain stream, when the trail led to West River, or Wantasticook, emptying into the Connecticut. And still another way to West River and the Connecticut was from the head of the lake up the Pawlet River. Of these routes, that by the Winooski was so frequently taken that the English named the stream the French River; while that of which Otter Creek was a part, being the easiest and the nearest to Crown Point, was perhaps the oftenest used, and was commonly known as the 'Indian road.' All these warpaths, familiar to every Waubanakee warrior with every stream and landmark bearing names which his fathers had given them, led through Vermont, then only known to English-speaking men as 'The Wilderness.'"—(Pages 10, 11.)

system extending from New York Bay to the St. Lawrence, which has been a highway of war ever since whenever the people of the two regions have been engaged in hostilities. In 1696 Fort Frontenac was built, where Kingston now stands—or rather it was rebuilt, for it had once been destroyed. The purpose of the Governor of Canada in building this post was to secure the alliance of the friendly Indians, to overawe the Iroquois, to carry on the fur trade, and to command the outlet to Lake Ontario. It played an important part in wilderness history. At the conclusion of peace, Count Frontenac, the French governor, had seriously weakened the power of the Five Nations, had confirmed and extended his alliances with the Indians of the West, had repelled the English theory of Iroquois sovereignty, and had put matters in fine train for the further development of the French policy. Dongan's plan had completely failed.

In the short interval of peace, Count Frontenac took another important step. In 1686 he caused De Luht to construct Fort St. Joseph at the head of Ste. Claire River, and in 1701 he sent Cadillac to plant the colony and build the stockade of Detroit. These posts securely closed the Northwest to the English.

In Queen Anne's War (1702-'13) the English made another ineffectual attempt to strike Canada by the way of Lake Champlain. At the treaty of Utrecht France ceded to England Newfoundland, and Acadia with its ancient boundaries ; and, what was still more important in our view, she formally admitted that the Five Nations or Cantons were subjects of Great Britain.

Years before war again broke out both sides were taking steps that made war still more certain. In 1720, Vaudreuil, Governor of Canada, built at the mouth of the Niagara River a fort of the same name, near the spot that had once been occupied by La Salle. Of all points on the lakes this was now the most important one for the French to hold. In 1732, Governor Burnett, of New York, in order to throw up a bulwark between the Iroquois and Canada, constructed a

fortified trading post at the mouth of the Oswego River. This was the first time that the English had made even a beginning on the chain of Great Lakes ; the French had made their beginnings more than one hundred years before. Oswego was intended as an answer to Forts Frontenac and Niagara, and it foretold the day when an English flotilla and army would descend the St. Lawrence to the conquest of Canada. In the meantime the rival colonies were feeling their way toward Lake Champlain. The English established settlements and posts on the upper Connecticut, in western Massachusetts, in southern Vermont, and in the wilderness where lie the sources of Lakes George and Champlain. In 1665 the French had occupied Isle La Motte, and in 1730-'31 they seized the narrows of Lake Champlain and constructed the formidable Fort Frederic, at Crown Point. This act planted them in "the gate of the country," as the Iroquois called the lake, along both sides of which French settlements began slowly to spread. The French had now fully taken up La Salle's original idea. In the far West also France was fortifying her right with might. As early as 1735 French colonists crossed the Kankakee portage to the Wabash Valley, where they planted a long, thin line of settlements, of which Vincennes was the chief. Afterward these colonists reached Canada by the St. Marys, the Maumee, and Lake Erie. Still other settlements and fortified posts were established on the Illinois and the Mississippi Rivers, on the Tennessee and the Alabama. Only one great river valley the possession of which was essential to her policy had France failed to secure down to 1744.

King George's War (1744-'48) was marked by the old features : naval battles, French and Indian forays, and futile schemes to invade Canada by Lake Champlain. The treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle restored all conquests that had been made in the course of the war on either side, and as its negotiators could not agree upon boundary lines, and particularly upon the ancient boundaries of Acadia, they referred such questions to a joint commission, which, however,

could not agree, and so accomplished nothing. The truth is, the relations of the two powers in America had become so strained that only the sword could render a decisive verdict. The peace was therefore of short duration.

The time had finally come for the English colonists to show a real interest in the country beyond the mountains. For some time the hunter and trader had been following the deer through the mountain passes to the streams flowing to the Mississippi, and now the explorer and the pioneer began to follow the hunter and trader. In 1748 Dr. Walker, with a company of Virginians, made his way into the West, discovering and naming the Cumberland Mountains and Cumberland and Louisa Rivers. In the same year the first transmontane settlement was made, at Draper's Meadow, on New River, a branch of the Kanawha. In 1748 also the Ohio Company was formed; it obtained a grant of five hundred thousand acres of land on the Kanawha and Monongahela Rivers, and ordered large shipments of goods from London, preparatory to embarking in land speculation and in the Indian trade. About the same time the Will's Creek route from the Potomac to the Ohio was discovered. In 1750-'51 Christopher Gist, an agent of the Ohio Company, explored both sides of the Ohio for a considerable distance below the forks. The Indians occupying the country between the Ohio and Lake Erie were found generally friendly to the English, and the Pennsylvanians and Virginians carried on a large trade with them.

While the French and Indian War was only the American side of the Seven Years' War, it began before hostilities broke out in Europe and originated in a purely American issue. This was the line of demarcation between Canada and her dependencies and the English colonies. France proposed a geographical boundary. She claimed that all countries drained by streams falling into the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi should belong to Canada. This would have planted her securely on the ridges and mountain crests separating the Lake and St. Lawrence Basin

and the Mississippi Valley from the Atlantic slope, giving France all the interior of the continent, and leaving nothing to England but her old strip of seacoast. The accomplishment of this claim would be the full realization of the policy that she had so long pursued. France rested her claim on the work of her discoveries and explorers, missionaries, and bushrangers. Moreover, it must be admitted that this was a reasonable title compared with the claim that England now advanced. That power now practically abandoned the Cabot title to the whole breadth of the continent, and brought forward a new one. In 1684 the Iroquois had placed themselves under the protection of the Duke of York and of Charles II; in 1713 the French had solemnly admitted that the Five Tribes were subjects of Great Britain; in 1726 the tribes conveyed to England their lands in trust for the grantors, with little sense, no doubt, of what they were doing. Nor was this all: the Iroquois claimed all territories that their war parties had overrun, and the English now set up the claim that they stood in the same relation to these territories that they did to the original Iroquois lands in New York. This was claiming not only the country between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, but also that between Lakes Erie and Huron and the Ottawa River, for this region was also an Iroquois conquest dating from the destruction of the Huron missions. Indeed, the Tribes had formally ceded it all to the English, including Detroit; still further, in 1744 they made to Virginia a deed that covered a large part of the whole West.

As we have seen, the French had strung a long line of posts through the Western wilderness, extending from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico, resting their claim upon discovery and occupancy. The English now made ready to cross the mountains in force, pleading their Iroquois title. Given all the factors that have been enumerated as national and colonial characters and tendencies and geographical relations, the great contest of arms that now came on was inevitable.

French America had two heads—one among the snows of Canada, and one among the canebrakes of Louisiana; one communicating with the world through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and the other through the Gulf of Mexico. These vital points were feebly connected by a chain of military posts, slender and often interrupted, circling through the wilderness nearly three thousand miles. Midway between Canada and Louisiana lay the valley of the Ohio. If the English should seize it, they would sever the chain of posts and cut French America asunder. If the French held it, and entrenched themselves well along its eastern limits, they would shut their rivals between the Alleghanies and the sea, control all the tribes of the West, and turn them, in case of war, against the English borders—a frightful and insupportable scourge.*

Mr. Parkman here reveals the one step necessary to her policy that France had neglected to take; she had not seized and fortified the forks of the Ohio. This position was absolutely essential to the control of that river, and ultimately even to the control of the Mississippi itself. Why, then, had not France placed herself in that gateway as promptly as she had occupied the portals of the Niagara and the Detroit? The answer to this question is, that the position was an exposed one—the attempt to hold it dangerous. Its possession would necessitate a line of communications extending from Canada by the foot of Lake Erie and the Alleghany River to the forks—a long line that could be easily struck and broken, unless made very strong indeed, by any one of the colonies, New York, Pennsylvania, or Virginia, to say nothing of the Iroquois. Then it lay well within the region that England claimed. So France deferred seizing the country lying between Lake Erie and the Ohio River as long as possible, in the meantime establishing connections between the two heads of New France farther to the West. It is a significant fact that Frenchmen had explored and mapped the far Northwest, Michigan, and Illinois, long before they had any definite knowledge of the

* Parkman: *Montcalm and Wolf*, vol. i, pp. 39, 40.

present State of Ohio. But the logic of events had now brought things to such a pass that she could no longer hesitate to act.

It may be again remarked that it is not easy to exaggerate the part that the Iroquois played in early American history. Mr. Parkman has shown very plainly that if France could have brought these haughty tribes under her full influence, American history would have reached its destined goal, but by different routes from those actually followed. An Indian empire ruled by French priests would have occupied the Mississippi Valley ; war would have been repressed and agriculture encouraged ; the West would have been cut up into fiefs and feudalism established ; the English colonies would have been longer confined to the Atlantic Plain ; when the final conflict drew on, absolutism would have opposed to them a much stronger resistance, and American independence would have been deferred, how long no one can tell, not to speak of the later modifying influence of French ideas upon American civilization. As it was, the Five Nations constantly weakened Canada, and retarded the growth of French absolutism until English liberty became equal to the final struggle.*

The Walker expedition, the Draper settlement on New River, the Ohio Company, Gist's explorations, and the pacific temper of the Ohio Indians have already been mentioned. The Pennsylvanians also were beginning to find their way over the mountains. So in 1749 Governor Galissonière sent Bienville from Canada by Lake Chautauqua and the Alleghany into the Ohio Valley, directing him to take possession of it in the name of France, to placate the Indians, and to thwart the English. In 1753 Duquesne sent a force to seize and hold French Creek and the upper Alleghany. Early in 1754 a small force of Virginians occupied and began to fortify the forks of the Ohio ; but before they had finished their work a much stronger French force descended

* The Jesuits in North America, pp. 446-449.

the Alleghany, seized the Virginians, and proceeded to construct Fort Duquesne. This act placed France at once in the doorway of the West and precipitated the final conflict. The next year Braddock advanced against Duquesne with a view of cutting New France asunder, but his army was defeated and himself killed on the Monongahela.

The war had not far advanced before the English Cabinet was dominated by a statesman who had a clear American policy, and the vigor necessary to carry it into execution. William Pitt proposed nothing less than the conquest of Canada, and the war now assumed that form. To Canada there were three lines of approach. The first was the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, guarded by the fortifications of Louisburg and Quebec. The second was Lakes George and Champlain and the River Richelieu—a route that the French, not content with their previous precautions, quickly safe-guarded by constructing the fortress of Ticonderoga. The third route led from Oswego, by Lake Ontario and the upper St. Lawrence, to the heart of Canada. The shifting scenes of the long war need not here be even sketched. Considering alone the great disparity of the French and English colonies in numbers and in wealth, we should be surprised that the contest continued nine years; but it is important to remember that the French colonies were far more effective in war than the English, that they waged a defensive struggle, and that they were supported by France, as their competitors were by England. It is still more important to observe that by every one of the three routes Nature offered the greatest obstacles to the progress of the English arms.

“‘Geography,’ says Von Moltke, ‘is three fourths of military science’; and never was the truth of his words more fully exemplified. Canada was fortified with vast out-works of defense in the savage forests, marshes, and mountains that encompassed her, where the thoroughfares were streams choked with fallen trees and obstructed by cataracts. Never was the problem of moving troops encumbered with

baggage and artillery a more difficult one. The question was less how to fight the enemy than how to get at him. If a few practicable roads had crossed this broad track of wilderness, the war would have been shortened and its character changed." *

All these obstacles were finally overcome ; and in 1760 Montreal, the last Canadian stronghold, fell before the advance of the three English armies that, coming by the three different routes, effected a junction in its neighborhood on the same day. France now retired from the continent. She ceded in 1763 part of her North American possessions to England and part to Spain, the Mississippi River and the Iberville becoming the boundary between them.

This rapid view of a contest, the vast consequences of which are more fully seen as time goes by, reveals the elements of power that were arrayed on either side. As Professor Shaler puts the case :

Throughout their efforts in North America, the French showed a capacity for understanding the large questions of political geography, a genius for exploration, and a talent for making use of its results, or guiding their way to dominion, that is in singular contrast with the blundering processes of their English rivals. They seem to have understood the possibilities of the Mississippi Valley a century and a half before the English began to understand them. They planted a system of posts and laid out lines for commerce through this region ; they strove to organize the natives into civilized communities ; they did all that the conditions permitted to achieve success. Their failure must be attributed to the want of colonists, to the essential irreclaimableness of the American savage, and to the want of a basis for extended commerce in this country. There were no precious metals to tempt men into this wilderness, and none of the fancy for life or for lands among the home people—that wandering instinct which has been the basis of all the imperial power of the English race. Thus a most cleverly devised scheme of continental occupation, which was admirably well adapted

* Parkman : Montcalm and Wolfe, vol. ii, pp. 380, 381.

to the physical conditions of the country, never came near to success. It fell beneath the clumsy power of another race that had the capacity for fixing itself firmly in new lands, and that grew without distinct plan until it came to possess it altogether.

At the critical periods in the long struggle much was said by both parties about "their rights"; but our balancing arguments *pro* and *con* is little to the purpose, for the issue was one that grew out of geography and love of dominion, and hence one that only force could determine.

Mr. Bancroft says the issue of 1754 was which of the two languages should be the mother tongue of the future millions of the West—whether the Romanic or the Teutonic race should form the seed of its people. The issue was a broader one than the destiny of the West—was none other than the destiny of the major part of North America. Should the institutions of England, or of France and Spain, spread over the larger share of its surface? The immediate issue of the war derives most of its significance from a second inevitable conflict to which it soon led. Mr. Fiske has called Wolfe's triumph on the Plains of Abraham, which really determined the struggle, the greatest turning point in modern history; and Mr. Green assigns the reason when he calls this triumph the beginning of the history of the United States.

NOTE.—The conflicting claims are well shown by Parkman: *Fifty Years of Conquest*, vol. i, p. 204, vol. ii, pp. 63, 273; *Montcalm and Wolfe*, vol. i, pp. 37, 61, 79, 122-128, 168, 236-238, 259, vol. ii, p. 86.

CHAPTER XVIII.

A CONSPECTUS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

References.—See histories of the United States previously referred to. Carrington: Boston and New York, The Battles of the Revolution, The Strategic Relations of New Jersey (these books are military studies of the war); Gilmore: The Rear Guard of the American Revolution; Roosevelt: Winning the West (particularly Chaps. II., III., IX); Perkins: Annals of the West; Campbell and Cooley: Previous references; Fiske: The American Revolution.

LAFAYETTE called the Revolution “the grandest of contests, won by the skirmishes of sentinels and outposts.” Skirmishes the battles certainly were as compared with the great battles of Europe or of our Civil War; moreover, they were so scattered, were fought by so many different men, and looked directly to such different ends, that it is not easy to bring them together into one general view. The only way to overcome the difficulty is: (1) To frame a clear outline map of the whole theater of action, of its several divisions and their relations; (2) To perceive clearly not only the grand ends of the war—conquest on the one part and defense on the other—but also the particular ends of the several divisions of the action; (3) To concentrate the attention on the important points, leaving detail and side incidents to fall out of the mind. These observations are, of course, equally pertinent to all similar cases. To illustrate them, the following conspectus of the Revolution is submitted:

I. In no other part of the country were American ideas so fully developed as in New England. In the march toward independence, New England led the country, Massa-

chusetts led New England, and Boston led Massachusetts. To enforce the obnoxious laws, to overawe the province, and to check, if possible, the spread of dangerous ideas, the British ministry had sent four regiments of troops to Boston in 1768. These troops were received by the people in no friendly spirit; and after the Boston Massacre of March, 1770, this spirit became more and more pronounced.

II. Events now moved rapidly in all the colonies. Every year saw some fresh act of British aggression and witnessed the higher rise of the spirit of resistance. When the royal governor dissolved the Massachusetts Legislature, it immediately reappeared as a provincial congress. There were committees of correspondence and committees of safety. In various colonies the militia were reorganized, put under patriotic captains, and drilled for active duty. Munitions of war—powder and ball and cannon—were gathered at various convenient places. Everything on the American side betokened war, if only the British officers should provoke it.

III. General Gage's attempt to destroy the munitions that had been gathered at Concord brought on the battle of Lexington, April 19, 1775, fired the country, and led to a general uprising of the people. Hundreds of armed men pressed hard after the British column as it retreated from Concord to Boston, and thousands more followed after the hundreds. Immediately the British troops were shut in between a patriotic host and the sea. In June, Bunker Hill was fought. In July, Washington took command of the American forces, and at once began to organize into an army the motley multitude that had gathered from far and near. Month after month he pressed the siege closer and closer; and in March, 1776, General Howe, who had succeeded General Gage, finding that his position could no longer be defended, put his troops on board the fleet and sailed away to Halifax.

IV. But the war was not over. The ministry dispatched the choicest troops of the British army and the finest ships

of the British navy to America. More than this, it sent over thousands of mercenaries hired or bought of the princes of Germany. It also summoned to its aid the savage warriors of the American forests. But Boston was not again molested, nor Massachusetts again invaded to the end of the war. Armed resistance to the ministry had extended to all the colonies; and the enemy, on his return, sought a place of attack that he thought more suitable for his purpose. While the royal forces are gathering at Halifax, we will take a glance at the country and people whom they are sent to subjugate.

V. The thirteen colonies, stretching along the Atlantic shore from the Piscataqua to the St. Marys, presented an ocean front more than fifteen hundred miles in length. This front was cut at short intervals by deep rivers that made excellent harbors for commerce, but also offered to an enemy ready means of access to the country. Jamestown, New York, and Plymouth were each more than one hundred and fifty years old; still the settlements were only a thin fringe to the continent, and by far the larger part of the Atlantic Plain was an unbroken forest. Mr. Bancroft estimates the total population at nearly 2,600,000, black and white. Virginia was the most populous colony, Georgia the least. The three principal cities were Philadelphia and New York, each with about 20,000 to 22,000 people, and Boston, with only 17,000. Lancaster, Pa., with 1,000 houses and 6,000 people, was the largest internal town. There were few men in the colonies owning property to the amount of \$200,000.

VI. If the king's ministers had ever flattered themselves that armed resistance to their policy would be local, they were quickly undeceived. The conflict which they had provoked was not the Boston, or even the Massachusetts, rebellion, but the American Revolution. At first there was no thought of independence. Such a purpose was directly disavowed. The sole object was to resist encroachments on ancient rights and to defend ancient privileges. But as the

purposes of the king's government became more and more distinctly revealed, a desire for separation from the mother country took the place of the demand for a redress of grievances. And so, on July 4, 1776, when there was not a British soldier within all their borders, this desire was expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

VII. The States were divided into three zones : New England, the Middle States, and the South. The New England States contained about 700,000 white inhabitants, the Middle States about the same number, the Southern States 800,000. Most of the four or five hundred thousand negroes were in the South. New England could be assailed from Boston and New York ; the Middle States from New York and Philadelphia; the South, from Chesapeake Bay, Cape Fear River, and Charleston. The British plan of campaign for the year 1776 embraced the whole country. Cape Fear River was chosen as the base of operations against the South; New York against the middle zone and the East. At the same time the ministry more than half expected that the States would be smitten with terror at sight of the powerful armaments sent against them, and so submit without further resistance.

VIII. Sir Henry Clinton and Sir Peter Parker were sent to the South. After collecting their forces in Cape Fear River, they bore away to Charleston. But the attack on Fort Sullivan failed as signally as the proclamation to the people that Clinton issued. Colonel Moultrie gallantly repulsed Parker's ships, and they sailed away to the North. It was more than two full years before the British renewed operations in the southern zone.

IX. New York was the principal point of attack. About a week after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence a powerful fleet with 30,000 troops on board arrived in the bay, and took possession of Staten Island. Lord Howe commanded the fleet, and his brother, General Howe, the army. Situated at the mouth of the Hudson, the city was the gateway to the interior of the State and to Canada. It

was within easy striking distance of the Connecticut and Rhode Island towns. New Jersey lay open to invasion from the city and bay, and Philadelphia was but ninety miles off to the southwest. The richest parts of the country were within a few days' march. It was the best center for naval operations on the coast. It was the metropolis of a State that was full of Tories, and a large number of its own population were loyal to the king. All in all, New York was as desirable a point for making war against the people of the Atlantic Plain then as it is for carrying on their commerce now.

X. After the British evacuation of Boston Washington had hurried to New York, bringing with him as many of his troops as possible. He had done his utmost to put the city in a state of defense. Some 20,000 men of all kinds, mostly undisciplined militia, had been gathered. Fortifications had been built at various favorable points below and above the city; but the defenses were insufficient, the stores and armaments scanty, the troops too few in numbers and too deficient in discipline. Toward the end of August the fighting began. The Americans lost the battle of Long Island. Washington now withdrew his forces to New York, and General Howe soon followed him. Little by little the whole island, including Forts Lee and Washington, fell into Howe's hands. Before the end of November the British commander had fully succeeded in the first object of his campaign. New York was his, and so defenseless seemed the country, whichever way he turned, that he might well have been embarrassed to tell where he should deliver his next blow. New York was the first city to fall into the hands of the enemy, and it remained longest in their possession.

XI. Washington threw what remained of his army across the Hudson into New Jersey. Here the British followed him, their purpose being to scatter the small remnant of his forces, to overrun the country between the coast and the Delaware, and to capture Philadelphia. December, 1776,

was the darkest month of the Revolution ; but Washington managed to keep the field in the enemy's front, falling back as he advanced. At last he crossed the Delaware, and secured on the western bank of the stream all the boats within reach. Lord Cornwallis, who was in command of the pursuing forces, expected to "catch him and end the war" as soon as the ice would bear his army. But Washington recrossed the river and surprised the enemy, first at Trenton and then at Princeton, inflicting severe losses at both places. Next he marched to Morristown, in the mountains of northern New Jersey, where Cornwallis did not dare attack him.

XII. Washington now held the range of low mountains extending southwest from Peekskill on the Hudson across the upper end of New Jersey, a line that he continued to hold most of the time until the end of the war. The British drew back toward Sandy Hook. The victories at Trenton and Princeton greatly encouraged the Americans, and convinced the king's generals that the war was not over. They had failed to capture Philadelphia, and were really shut up, on that side, to New York and the adjacent towns. In December the British captured Newport, R. I., which they held for the next three years.

XIII. Henceforth New York was the base of nearly all the British operations in America, no matter in which of the three zones they were conducted. These operations looked to three ends : 1, to cut off New England by controlling the Sound and the Hudson ; 2, to overrun and hold the Middle States ; 3, to subjugate the South. To thwart them in their large undertakings, while remaining apparently indifferent to their isolated and unimportant expeditions, now became Washington's steady policy. To this end he occupied strong positions in New Jersey, as at the hub of a wheel, so near to New York that the British generals could not venture out of the city in force without endangering their base, while Washington kept his army compact for effective fighting when he was disposed. New York and Pennsylvania were the two theaters of war in 1777.

XIV. In the spring of 1775 Ethan Allen and Benedict Arnold captured the British fortresses on Lake Champlain, Ticonderoga and Crown Point. Later the same year, Generals Schuyler and Montgomery, with a small force, descended the lake, and in November captured Montreal. A little later Montgomery effected a junction with General Arnold, who with another small force had made his way through the wilderness of Maine to Canada. The main object of this double invasion was, if possible, to enlist the people of Canada in the war and to effect a political union with them; but the Canadians, being of French descent, and having had no such training in self-government as the Americans, were indifferent to the contest. Montgomery and Arnold made a spirited attack on Quebec, but were repulsed, and Montgomery was killed. In the summer of 1776 the Americans abandoned Canada and retreated to the forts on Lake Champlain.

Under the circumstances, the invasion of Canada and the determined effort to effect its conquest may seem to have been doubtful policy. On the other hand, Congress was extremely anxious to induce the Canadians to make common cause with the States against England, and even more anxious to ward off Indian attacks from that quarter, and to keep the country from becoming the base of such movements as those of Burgoyne, made two years later. John Adams wrote at the time :

The regulars [of the British army], if they get full possession of that province and the navigation of the St. Lawrence River above Deschambault—at least above the mouth of the Sorel—will have nothing to interrupt their communication with Niagara, Detroit, Michilimackinac; they will have the navigation of the five Great Lakes quite as far as the Mississippi River; they will have a free communication with all the numerous tribes of Indians extended along the frontiers of all the colonies, and by their trinkets and bribes will induce them to take up the hatchet and spread blood and fire among the inhabitants; by which means all the frontier inhabitants will be driven in upon the middle settlements at a time

when the inhabitants of the seaports and coasts will be driven back by the British navy. Is this picture too high-colored? Perhaps it is; but surely we must maintain our power in Canada.*

XV. In the summer of 1777 General Burgoyne ascended Lake Champlain with 8,000 men. He expected to effect a junction near Albany with one British army from New York, and with another that should march from Lake Ontario by the way of Oswego and the Mohawk Valley, and then to descend the Hudson. His aim was to subdue the State of New York, to hold the whole line from the St. Lawrence to New York Bay, and to separate New England from the Union. He captured the lake forts, and drove the small American force before him as he advanced. Passing over the "divide" to the southward slope, he began to encounter such difficulties as many another general has encountered who finds himself in an enemy's country, far from his base of supplies. Provisions became scarce, his men fell by disease and in battle, the enemy in increasing numbers hung upon his rear, and became bolder in his front. A detachment that he sent to Bennington was annihilated. Checked at Bemus Heights and Stillwater in his efforts to break through the American army, defeated in his attempt to fall back toward Canada, and failing to meet the forces that he expected from the South and West, Burgoyne, at Saratoga, in October, surrendered to General Gates what remained of the army that he had led from Canada a few months before. Meantime General Clinton was ascending the Hudson, but learning of the surrender he retraced his steps to New York, while the force dispatched from Lake Ontario under St. Leger was defeated at Oriskany and compelled to turn back whence it came. After Burgoyne's defeat no further attempt was made to split the Union by driving a wedge through it from North to South. In the meantime important events were taking place in the middle zone.

XVI. In the spring of 1777 General Howe sought vainly

* Works, vol. ix, p. 399.

to bring Washington out of his strong position in northern New Jersey. He did not dare attempt a march from New York to Philadelphia, lest Washington should strike him in the flank as he passed by. So in July, leaving a force to hold New York, he put to sea with eight thousand men to attempt from the south the capture of that city. Philadelphia was as large and wealthy a city as New York, and in some respects was even more important. Surrounded by a rich and populous country, situated on the Delaware midway between the North and the South, and readily accessible from both directions, it was the continental city of the Revolution.

XVII. General Howe landed his forces at Elkton, at the head of Chesapeake Bay. Appreciating fully the importance of the city, Washington marched south and threw his army across the line of the British advance. At Chadd's Ford, on the Brandywine, he was defeated. Howe advanced and took possession of Philadelphia. Washington attacked again at Germantown, and was again defeated. Forts Mifflin and Mercer, which had compelled the British general to ascend the Chesapeake rather than the Delaware, soon fell into his hands. General Howe proceeded to quarter his troops in Philadelphia. Washington marched up the Schuylkill to Valley Forge, where his army passed a miserable winter, half-fed, half-clothed, half-housed, and scourged by disease. The American cause seemed almost as desperate as the winter before. Still Washington managed to hold his troops together. In the meantime the capture of Burgoyne was preparing important events abroad.

XVIII. Ever since the French and Indian War France had hoped to see England and her American colonies estranged. She remembered keenly her own losses in that war, and still bore her traditional ill-will to England. Knowing this, the American Congress had sought to bring France into an American alliance. Convinced by the Declaration of Independence that the States meant separation, and by the overthrow of Burgoyne that they would not improbably succeed in the end, the French Government now

yielded to persuasion, and early in 1778 entered into a treaty of commerce and a treaty of alliance with the young nation. This alliance proved to be of the greatest importance. The next year Spain also declared war against England.

XIX. In the spring of 1778 the British line was an arc extending from Newport to Philadelphia. It was too long to be held against a strong and active enemy occupying a position without the arc, and free to attack it with his whole force, as Washington was, at any point. News now came that a French fleet and army might at any time be expected on the coast. Sir Henry Clinton, who had succeeded Howe in the chief command, thought it necessary to evacuate Philadelphia and concentrate his forces at New York. Not daring to try the fortunes of the sea, for fear of the French, he abandoned the city and began a march toward New York across New Jersey. Washington hastened to follow him, and an indecisive battle was fought at Monmouth Court House. Clinton reached Sandy Hook, and arrived at his destination by way of the bay.

XX. The British commanders had now failed in the Middle States as well as in the North. They continued to hold New York to the end of the war, while Washington held, as before, his strong line extending from the Hudson to Morristown. In 1778 Count D'Estaing arrived on the coast with a French fleet and army ; but after threatening Newport and New York, accomplishing nothing, he sailed to the West Indies. After this there was little fighting north of the Potomac. However, a few noteworthy events on land and water should be noticed before we go to the South.

XXI. In 1778-'79 George Rogers Clarke, acting under the authority of Virginia, gathered a force west of the mountains, crossed the Ohio River, and wrested from the British the territory now comprising the States of Illinois and Indiana. In 1779 General Anthony Wayne stormed Stony Point, on the Hudson. Toward the close of the next year General Arnold attempted to betray to the enemy

West Point, which he commanded, but his plan was defeated. From time to time the British commanders sent marauding expeditions along the coast, and these plundered and burned some of the fairest towns of Connecticut, New Jersey, and Virginia. On the frontier the Tory and the Indian, each rivaling the other in deeds of blood, laid waste some flourishing settlements, as Wyoming and Cherry Valley.

XXII. Before the war had begun the States had reached a high degree of maritime enterprise and prosperity. In a single line of ocean industry they won from Edmund Burke the eulogium : "No sea but what is vexed by their fisheries. No climate that is not witness to their toils. Neither the perseverance of Holland, nor the activity of France, nor the dexterous and firm sagacity of English enterprise, ever carried this most perilous mode of hardy industry to the extent to which it has been pushed by this recent people—a people who are still, as it were, but in the gristle, and not yet hardened into the bone of manhood." Naturally such a people as this sought their enemy on the water as well as on the land. They were unable to cope with the English navy ; but their privateers vexed British commerce and seized many rich prizes. The voyages of some of the American armed vessels are tales of wild ocean romance. The most famous was that of John Paul Jones along the coast of England and Scotland in the autumn of 1778—a voyage that ended in the terrific battle of the *Bon Homme Richard* and the *Serapis*.

XXIII. After the retreat from Philadelphia, in 1778, the British generals turned their attention mainly to the South. Late in that year an expedition from New York captured Savannah, and soon all Georgia fell into British hands. In September, 1779, General Lincoln and Count d'Estaing attempted the recapture of Savannah, but failed. Early the next year, General Clinton, having first caused Newport to be evacuated and collected his available troops at New York, sailed to Charleston. In May he compelled the surrender

of the city and its garrison of six thousand men, commanded by General Lincoln. Clinton now returned to New York, leaving Lord Cornwallis with a force deemed adequate to finish the conquest of the whole South.

XXIV. The Southern States were full of Tories. The ferocious partisan warfare that had raged in Georgia for many months now extended to South Carolina, involving the State from the mountains to the sea. The history of the Revolution has not its parallel. With its swamp encampments, night marches, hard-fought battles, desperate ventures, and narrow escapes, this is the most thrilling chapter in the whole history of the war. In these encounters Colonel Tarleton, commander of Cornwallis's dragoons, greatly distinguished himself on the one side, and Generals Sumter and Marion on the other.

XXV. General Gates, the victor of Saratoga, was now the commander of the Southern army ; completely defeated at Camden in August, 1780, he disappeared from the scene, and General Greene succeeded him. By pursuing a policy at once bold and wary, now advancing and now retreating, now fighting and now eluding his enemy, Greene restored the desperate fortunes of the war. General Morgan, one of his subordinates, defeated Tarleton at Cowpens, in January, 1781. Greene himself was defeated at Guilford Court House in March of the same year, but Cornwallis gained nothing by the victory, and soon retired to Wilmington on the coast. Greene now moved down into South Carolina, where he found Lord Rawdon in command of the English forces. Here Greene was generally defeated in the fighting, but he conducted his campaign with such caution, activity, and prudence, that by the end of the year he had practically shut the enemy up in Charleston and Savannah. He won also the important battle of Eutaw Springs.

XXVI. Cornwallis, at Wilmington, knew nothing of Greene's march to South Carolina until it was too late to stop him. So, thinking Lord Rawdon strong enough to hold that State, he turned his attention to the North. Since

January a British force had been in the waters of Virginia, burning towns and laying waste plantations. Cornwallis took now the resolution to march to the Chesapeake, effect a junction with this force, and subdue Virginia. The march was made and the junction effected, and his lordship found himself in command of eight thousand men. In obedience to orders from New York to hold and fortify some point on the coast accessible to the fleet, he made choice of the junction of James and York Rivers. Cornwallis arrived in Virginia in May, and took possession of Yorktown in August.

XXVII. General Rochambeau, with a French army, had landed at Newport in the summer of 1780, and afterward joined Washington on the Hudson. Early in 1781 Washington began to threaten New York. He expected the arrival of a French force strong enough to enable him to invest the city. But in August he learned that the fleet and army about to arrive on the coast from the West Indies, to remain four months only, were destined for Chesapeake Bay. He now resolved to march rapidly to Virginia, join the French, and capture Cornwallis before succor could reach him from the North. Accordingly he put his own and Rochambeau's troops in motion for the South, leaving a force sufficient to hold his old line, and taking pains to conceal his purpose from Clinton, until his left flank was beyond striking distance from New York.

XXVIII. The fleet of Count De Grasse arrived in the Capes at the end of August. This fleet closed the bay to Cornwallis's escape, and beat off a British squadron sent to his relief. The allied army from the North marched to the head of the Chesapeake, and was then conveyed down the bay in transports. Lafayette had commanded for some time a small force in Virginia, with which he had vainly sought to oppose the British. A junction of the various forces was speedily effected, and on September 30 the investment of Yorktown began. So vigorously and skillfully was the siege prosecuted that Lord Cornwallis, unable longer to resist the attacks by land, or to escape by sea, on Octo-

ber 19, 1781, surrendered his army, with all his artillery, stores, and munitions of war. And this ended the Virginia campaign.

XXIX. The campaign in Virginia over, De Grasse sailed with the French fleet to the West Indies ; and Washington, having first sent a re-enforcement to Greene, returned to his watch on the Hudson. The surrender of Cornwallis was the real end of the contest. Partisan warfare went on at the South some time longer, but the great armies now stood still, waiting the motions of the diplomatists. Yorktown produced a profound impression in England. Opposition to the continuance of the war became so strong, that George III was compelled to consent to peace and to independence. Negotiations between the representatives of the two Governments began in Paris in April, 1782, but events moved so slowly that it was November 30th before the preliminary treaty of peace was signed. In July, 1782, the British evacuated Savannah, in December of the same year Charleston, and in November, 1783, New York. Washington disbanded the Continental army in April, 1783, and in December following surrendered his commission to Congress. The definitive treaty of peace bears the date, September 3, 1783.

To put such a general view as this before a pupil when he begins the history of the Revolution would be to invite failure. The pupil must begin with details, and gradually work out his own generalization. A conspectus is the end and not the beginning of the study. At the same time, the teacher can not assist the pupil to gain that end unless he clearly sees the conspectus from the beginning.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE WAR OF 1812.

References.—Bancroft, Hildreth, Bryant and Gay, Schouler, and Adams: Histories of the United States; Winsor: The Narrative and Critical History of America; Hart: Formation of the Union, 1750-1829.

THE War of 1812 presents to our view a large number of military operations scattered over wide areas, and more or less isolated and disconnected in character. It is even more difficult to reduce them to something like unity than it is to perform the same office in the case of the Revolution. We must first seize the geographical relations of the United States and the American possessions of Great Britain, observe the distribution of population, compare the military and naval strength of the two powers, and master the main ideas that they desired to carry out. A glance at these factors will show that, save on the ocean, the war was necessarily confined to three great theaters: the Northern frontier, the Atlantic seaboard, and the Gulf coast.

The naval superiority of England made an invasion of Canada by the Gulf of St. Lawrence impossible, and also precluded attacks upon the British West Indies. Furthermore, the vast wilderness extending from the St. Croix to the cleft that divides the Appalachian Mountains was a secure shield to Canada, and also to New England. The Champlain-Richelieu Valley—the old highway of war—still lay open to both powers. In the region of the upper lakes the only war that was possible was a war of posts. But at the narrowing of the great Northern water-way the

combatants could get at and strike each other : the Detroit River, the Niagara River, and the upper St. Lawrence. Even at these places, however, war could be carried on only under great difficulties. In 1810 there was not a considerable town in the western half of New York ; the names Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo do not appear on the map. The population of Ohio was 230,000, Indiana 25,000, Illinois 12,000, Michigan 5,000, in the first three States mostly found in the southern parts, and in the fourth in and around Detroit. The total population of Canada was but 400,000, of which a quarter only was found in the present province of Ontario. Good roads did not exist on either side of the frontier, and transportation was difficult and expensive. The lakes could not become scenes of naval conflict until both powers could construct armed vessels.

The enormous preponderance of England's naval force made it easy for her to blockade the whole coast from the St. Croix to the St. Marys, and also to land troops at almost any point that she chose. Halifax, the Bermudas, and Jamaica furnished the best possible bases of operation for these purposes. In the Gulf of Mexico her naval supremacy and her naval stations enabled England to do as she pleased, so long as she kept within cannon shot of her ships of war.

Although the three regions now mentioned were extensive, it would not be difficult to arrange the facts in due order, were it not for the elements of time and causation. These complicate the problem. Geography and causation, however, are so closely related that we may consider them as one. Accordingly, three questions arise relating to method :

1. Shall we arrange the facts in three great groups or series, as though the whole action were confined to the three regions respectively? This would be excluding the time element, save as it appears within the groups. It would be a simple method, but it would leave wholly out of view, in every case, what was going on in the two other regions at the same time. The result would be that our views would be partial ones.

2. Shall we pay exclusive attention to time, arranging the facts in the order of the dates on which they occur, without regard to place or causation? This would also be simple, but it would be open to the fatal objection that events would be thrown wholly out of geographical and causal relation, and that the pupil would form a general picture of the whole field, but not a clear picture of any part of it.

3. Shall we combine the two methods just suggested, partially sacrificing time to place, and place to time, thus somewhat complicating the picture, but also heightening the effect produced by its several parts? This, no doubt, is the proper course to follow. It can be followed the more readily because, for the first year, little was done save at the North.

The War of 1812 was forced upon the country, under great provocation indeed, by the Young Republicans, who then dominated the Republican party and the country. These political leaders promised in advance that the war should be one of conquest. Mr. Clay, easily the first of them, declared: "We can take Canada without soldiers. We have only to send officers into the province, and the people, disaffected toward their own Government, will rally round our standard. . . . We have the Canadas as much under our command as Great Britain has the ocean, and the way to conquer her on the ocean is to drive her from the land. I am not for stopping at Quebec or anywhere else, but I would take the whole continent from them and ask no favors." John Randolph, ridiculing such pretensions as these, said the Young Republicans looked for a "holiday campaign," "with no expense of blood or treasure on our part," but "Canada was to conquer herself, to be subdued by the principal of fraternity." But the British did not intend to permit the war to become one of defense merely; the home Government prepared to support the Canadians with all the troops and ships that could be spared from the great struggle then going on in Europe.

If we regard the Northern water-way as an arc of a circle,

we shall see that the British stood within, the Americans without that arc. This relation gave the British important advantages: news, orders, troops and munitions of war, could be sent from Quebec and Montreal to Mackinaw or Detroit much more quickly than from Washington or New York; the British generals could move on chords of the circle, while the Americans were compelled to move on its circumference. General Hull, it will be remembered, first heard of the declaration of war from the enemy. The British had another great advantage in their Indian allies. The more resolute of the Western Indians had never made up their minds that the West was lost to their race; and before the breaking out of hostilities, Tecumseh, passing back and forth between the Indians of the North and of the South, had succeeded in constructing his "dam" to hold back "the mighty waters ready to overflow his people." The people of Michigan complained with reason that they stood on a double frontier, facing outward toward Canada and inward toward the Indians. As a vigorous writer has said:

During the War of 1812 there was played out the final act in the military drama of which the West had been the stage during the lifetime of a generation. For this war had a twofold aspect: on the seaboard it was regarded as a contest for the rights of our sailors and as a revolt against Great Britain's domineering insolence; west of the mountains, on the other hand, it was simply a renewal on a large scale of the Indian struggles, all the red-skinned peoples joining together in a great and last effort to keep the lands which were being wrested from them; and there Great Britain's part was chiefly that of ally to the savages, helping them with her gold and with her well-drilled mercenary troops. The battle of the Thames is memorable rather because of the defeat and death of Tecumseh than because of the flight of Proctor and the capture of his British regulars; and for the opening of the Southwest, the ferocious fight at the Horseshoe Bend was almost as important as the far more famous contest of New Orleans.*

* Roosevelt: Thomas H. Benton (Commonwealth Series), p. 8.

1812. The war opened in the Northwest. Hull's invasion of Canada proved a miserable failure, and on August 16 he surrendered Detroit and all Michigan to General Brock. A British force from Georgian Bay had seized Mackinaw still earlier. It is evident that the British ministry meditated the reconquest of the whole region. Their Indian allies drew them to the Detroit frontier. Green Bay soon followed Mackinaw, and in 1814 a strong force of Canadians and Indians captured Prairie du Chien, from which point a smaller force descended the Mississippi to Rock Island, which it fortified and held. The purpose of the home Government accounts for the course of General Proctor in seeking to coerce the citizens of Detroit to take the oath of allegiance to the King of England.

Hull's crossing of the Detroit was only one of several projected offensive movements for the year 1812. One army of invasion was collected on the Niagara, a second at the foot of Lake Ontario and the head of the St. Lawrence, and a third at Plattsburg, on Lake Champlain. While none of these expeditions proved as disastrous as Hull's, they all signally failed to accomplish their purpose. General Brown repelled an attack upon Ogdensburg, but Van Rensselaer's and Symthe's attempts on Queenstown Heights and Fort Erie came to nothing, while Dearborn's advance upon Montreal from Plattsburg did not go beyond the international line.

1813. The most important operations of the next year were on the Detroit River and near the head of Lake Erie. In this quarter General Harrison had been put in command, and he did his utmost to drive the British forces back upon their own soil. The battles of the Raisin, Fort Meigs, and Fort Stephenson require only mention. General Hull had told the authorities at Washington, before hostilities began, that the command of Lake Erie was essential to success; the Government wholly neglected his advice, but the British put afloat a squadron that commanded the lake and rendered the possession of Detroit secure. Commodore Perry's capture

of this squadron, on September 10, 1813, reversed the conditions of war on that frontier. General Harrison now crossed to the Canadian side and occupied Malden, at the mouth of the river, which Proctor had abandoned. The evacuation of Detroit by the British, its reoccupation by the Americans, the pursuit of Proctor, and the victory of the Thames soon followed. These successes practically closed the contest on that frontier, so far as civilized warfare was concerned. Harrison returned from the Thames to the Detroit, and sailed with the regular troops under his command for Buffalo.

All this year war raged on the Niagara and the St. Lawrence, with alternate successes and defeats. Late in the season two armies began to move upon Montreal, one down the St. Lawrence under General Wilkinson, the other down Lake Champlain under General Hampton, but both expeditions were abandoned long before they reached their destination. Commodore Chauncey, our naval commander on Lake Ontario, rendered services less brilliant than Perry's, but still efficient and valuable.

In 1813 England established an efficient blockade along our whole ocean front. An ingenious writer has likened the navigable waters that stretch up into Virginia to "fingers of an ocean hand, ready to bear to all the world the produce of the soil"; they gave equal opportunities for the operations of war, as the history of three wars well shows. Early in the year the British seized the wrist—that is, the entrance to Chesapeake Bay—and prepared to make the most of their success. But the principal events in that quarter came the following year.

1814. The tide of battle at the North now took a favorable turn. The Americans won important advantages on the Niagara. The most notable occurrence was the formidable military and naval expedition that was sent from Canada to effect a purpose like the one that Burgoyne had attempted in 1777. It advanced to Plattsburg; but Commodore Downey was compelled to strike his colors to Macdonough, and

then Sir George Prevost, commander of the land force, beat a hasty retreat to Canada.

The same year the enemy prepared to strike a fatal blow in the Chesapeake region. Here the important events were the British march upon Washington, the battle of Bladensburg, the capture of the city, the unsuccessful bombardment of Fort McHenry, and the battle of Baltimore. These operations over, Admiral Cockburn established his headquarters on Cumberland Island, off the Georgia coast. In 1813, also, a British force seized Maine as far west as the Penobscot, with a view of changing the boundary on that frontier on the conclusion of peace.

At the South events may be treated consecutively. In 1810 Louisiana had a population of 76,000 ; the Southwest Territory, now Alabama and Mississippi, 40,000 ; Tennessee, 261,000 ; and Kentucky, 406,000. The powerful Creek Confederacy occupied an extensive region north of the Gulf. In that year the United States took possession of Mobile, although Spain claimed it as lying within her territory. In 1813 the Tennessee militia were called out, under General Jackson, to overawe the Creeks, but as the savages appeared peaceable the troops were disbanded. Then followed the bloody massacre of Fort Mimms, near Mobile, in which nearly five hundred men, women, and children were slaughtered. Jackson now marched into the Indian country and inflicted upon the Creeks a series of defeats that effectually broke their power. About this time some British forces arrived on the Gulf coast, and there ensued the bombardment of Fort Bowyer and the affair of Barrancas. Jackson also seized Pensacola, because, as he said, the Spaniards gave aid and comfort to the Indians.

In 1814 the British ministry took advantage of the lull of war in Europe to send to Canada, to the Chesapeake, and to the Gulf of Mexico strong forces. The objects of the powerful expedition sent to the Gulf were two in number : to seize the mouth of the Mississippi, so as to cut the interior off once more from the sea, and to occupy and hold valuable

territory that would give them an advantage in treating for peace. Instructions issued to the commanders recommended attempts to seduce the people of Louisiana from their allegiance to the United States and to effect the return of that territory to Spain. These were large plans. Before they could be executed, however, the treaty of peace negotiated at Ghent adjourned them indefinitely ; but had it not been so, General Jackson's brilliant victory at New Orleans would have made them impossible.

In the negotiations at Ghent the British commissioners, acting under instructions, sought at first to secure large territorial advantages. They demanded (1) that a neutral belt between the United States and Canada should be established for the perpetual occupancy of the Indians, upon which neither party should be permitted to encroach, thus keeping the two countries asunder ; (2) that the international line should run along the southern side of the Great Lakes ; and (3) that a strip of Maine should be ceded such as would give England a road from Halifax to Quebec. In the end the boundaries of 1783 were re-established, and commissions were appointed to settle all disputed points respecting them, as will be explained in the next chapter. The Treaty of Ghent bears the date, December 24, 1814.

CHAPTER XX.

THE TERRITORIAL GROWTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

References.—I. General View. Johnston: Lalor's Cyclopædia of Political Science (Annexations); Walker: Statistical Atlas of the United States, Ninth Census; Winsor and Channing: Narrative and Critical History of the United States (Appendix to Chap. VII., Vol. VII.); Donaldson: The Public Domain; Hart: The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. I., pp. 169, 251 (The Disposition of our Public Lands), The Epoch Maps; Reclus: The Earth and its Inhabitants, North America, III. (The United States, Chap. I.); MacCoun: Historical Geography of the United States; McMaster: History of the People of the United States, Vol. II. (map showing land acquired by the United States from 1783 to 1885).

II. Treaties. Government publications: Treaties and Conventions between the United States and other Powers; The Statutes at Large of the United States; Charters and Constitutions (edited by Poore); The Resolution to admit Texas, Statutes at Large, Vol. IX., p. 108, and Poore, Vol. II., p. 1764.

III. Territorial claims made by Congress at the Revolution. The Secret Journals of the Congress of the Confederation, Vol. II., pp. 225, 326, 445; Vol. III., p. 155; Winsor: Narrative and Critical History, Vol. VII. (editorial notes to Chap. II.).

IV. Negotiations at Paris, 1782-'83. Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution, Vol. X., p. 7 (report made by the American commissioners); id., Vol. VIII., pp. 21, 129 (Jay's Letters); Bancroft: History, Vol. V., Chaps. V.-VII.; Jay: The Peace Negotiations of 1782, 1783, an address delivered before the New York Historical Society, November 27, 1883, Narrative and Critical History, Vol. VII., Chap. II. (The peace negotiations of 1782-'83); Winsor: Narrative and Critical History (editorial notes to Vol. VII., Chap. VII.);

Wharton: International Law of the United States, Vol. III., Appendix; (Peace negotiations of 1782-'83 with Great Britain); Angell: Narrative and Critical History, Vol. VII., Chap. VII. (The diplomacy of the United States); Lyman: The Diplomacy of the United States, Vol. I.; Lecky: History of England in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. IV., Chap. XV.; Lord Fitzmaurice: Life of William Earl Shelburne, Vol. III., Chaps. IV., VI.; John Adams: Works, Vol. I. (Appendix 6).

V. Louisiana. Adams: History of the United States of America, Vol. I., Chaps. XIV.-XVII., Vol. II., Chaps. II.-V. (the best existing account); McMaster: History of the People of the United States, Vol. II., Chap. XIII.; Hart: The Formation of the Constitution; Von Holst: Constitutional and Political History of the United States, 1750-1828; Lyman, Angell, Hildreth, and Schouler: as before; Jefferson's writings, Vol. IV.

VI. Florida. Adams, Lyman, Hildreth, Schouler, Angell, Von Holst, and Hart: as before; Morse: John Quincy Adams; Gilman: James Monroe; Sumner: Andrew Jackson.

VII. Texas. Schurz: Henry Clay; Roosevelt: T. H. Benton; Von Holst: The Constitutional and Political History, 1828-'46, John C. Calhoun; Benton: Thirty Years' View (*passim*); Greeley: The American Conflict, Vol. I.; Yoakum: History of Texas; Wilson: Division and Reunion; Schouler: as before.

VIII. The first Mexican annexation. Schurz, Roosevelt, Benton, Greeley, Schouler, and Wilson: as before; Von Holst: Constitutional and Political History of the United States, 1846-'50, John C. Calhoun.

IX. The second Mexican annexation. Schouler and Wilson: as before; Von Holst: Constitution and Political History, 1850-'54.

X. Oregon. Barrows: Oregon; Greenhow: History of Oregon and California; Benton: Thirty Years' View; H. H. Bancroft: History of Oregon; Curtis: Life of James Buchanan, Life of Daniel Webster.

XI. Alaska. H. H. Bancroft: History of Alaska; Sumner: Works, Vol. XI., p. 181 (The Cession of Russian America to the United States).

In 1783 the United States contained eight hundred and twenty thousand square miles of territory. At present they contain three million five hundred thousand square miles.

If we follow the steps of this extraordinary territorial growth we shall pass in review some of the principal forces that have acted in the national history, and also furnish an illustration of the organization of facts.

I. The Original United States.

The Treaty of Paris, made with England at the close of the Revolutionary War, established our independence, and also gave us our first national boundaries, as follows : *North*, the highlands dividing the rivers that flow to the St. Lawrence from the rivers that flow to the Atlantic Ocean, the Connecticut River from its source to parallel 45° north, said parallel to its intersection with the St. Lawrence, the middle of the Lake and St. Lawrence water-way to Long Lake, the middle of this lake and the water connections beyond it to the northwesternmost corner of the Lake of the Woods, and a line drawn due west from this point to the Mississippi River ; *West*, the middle of the Mississippi from this point of intersection to parallel 31° north latitude ; *South*, parallel 31° to the Chattahoochee River, the middle of this stream to its junction with the Flint, a straight line drawn from this junction to the head of the St. Marys, and the middle of the St. Marys to the sea ; *East*, the ocean, including all islands within twenty leagues of the coast, save such as belonged to Nova Scotia, the middle of the St. Croix River from its mouth to its source, and a straight line drawn due north from such source to the place of beginning.

The rule that the negotiators on both sides professed to follow was, that the United States should comprise the territory that the thirteen colonies collectively had comprised ; but the boundaries of the colonies had been so vaguely defined that serious differences of opinion arose as to the application of the rule. At first, the American commissioners claimed that the St. Johns was the old boundary between New England and Nova Scotia, while the English insisted first upon the Piscataqua and afterward the Kennebec, and the Penobscot. On the north, Congress had instructed its

representatives to contend for a straight line from the intersection of the forty-fifth parallel and the St. Lawrence to the foot of Lake Nipissing, and a due west line from this point to the Mississippi, but afterward authorized them to accept the parallel of 45° from the Connecticut River to the Mississippi. On the west, the Americans, acting under instructions, contended that the middle of the Mississippi, which was made the dividing line between England and Spain in 1763, had been the western boundary of the colonies since that time, and was now therefore the proper limit of the States, and in support of this claim they advanced the ancient charters that had run through the continent from sea to sea and the Iroquois title of New York. The British diplomatists replied that the old charters had long before been annulled, and held that a royal proclamation issued in 1763 had limited the colonies on the west by a line so drawn that it would separate the heads of the streams of the Atlantic Plain from those of the Mississippi Valley. Still, south of the Ohio they were willing to yield; north of that river the country should remain a dependency of Canada. The Americans denied that the proclamation of 1763 had established a new boundary line, while they pointed to the facts that there were already considerable settlements of American citizens south of the Ohio, and that the region northwest of that river had been conquered by American troops in 1778, and had since been held by them. Spain had ceded Florida to England in 1763, but in the course of the war that she declared against England in 1779 she had recovered most of it; moreover, she was desirous of retaining all Florida at the peace, and also of obtaining possession of the eastern half of the Mississippi Valley south of the Ohio. England finally agreed that the parallel of 31° should be our boundary from the Mississippi to the Chattahoochee, but insisted upon the insertion of a secret article in the treaty, to the effect that the parallel passing through the mouth of the Yazoo, between these two rivers, should be the boundary, provided she should still retain Florida at the conclusion of peace; but as Florida

passed to Spain in 1783 this secret article fell to the ground.

Such were our first boundaries as drawn upon paper. Drawn upon the earth, they led through vast wastes of forest and waters of which the geography was largely unknown, and nothing was more natural than that disputes should arise between the parties when the time came to run out and mark the lines.

First, England ceded Florida to Spain about the time that she gave us our boundaries, without assigning any limits whatever. As England in 1764 had bounded the western province of Florida on the north by the parallel passing through the mouth of the Yazoo from the Mississippi to the Chattahoochee, Spain now claimed that parallel as her northern limit. In 1795 she yielded the point in our favor, and a few years later the line was surveyed and marked.

On the north, the first controversy was as to the identity of the St. Croix River. This was settled in the interest of the United States in 1798, by a joint commission appointed under one of the articles of Jay's treaty of four years before. The Treaty of Ghent (1814) divided the boundary questions at issue between the two contracting powers into four groups, and referred them to three joint commissions. The first commission should deal with the islands in Passamaquoddy and Fundy Bays ; the second commission should locate the line from the head of the St. Croix to the St. Lawrence ; while the third one should first run and mark the Lake and St. Lawrence boundary to the head of Lake Huron, and afterward the remaining section to the farthest corner of the Lake of the Woods. The first commission completed its work in 1817, and the third one finished the water-way line to the head of Lake Huron in 1822. The second commission could not agree, nor could the third one agree as to the Lake Superior division. The controversies as to these two sections of our northern boundary were finally disposed of by the Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842. Long before this, it had been discovered that the Mississippi could not be reached

by drawing a line due west from the northwestern point of the Lake of the Woods. Still further, the United States had purchased Louisiana without definite limits, which made it necessary for the two powers to establish a boundary between that province and Canada. The two questions were disposed of in 1818, by a treaty which provided that a due north-and-south line should be drawn through the farthest point of the Lake of the Woods to the forty-ninth parallel, and that parallel 49° should be the boundary between the two countries from the point of intersection to the Stony Mountains. These several treaties account for the Minnesota "jog."

II. Louisiana.

In a previous chapter we have seen that English settlements west of the Alleghanies did not begin until the middle of the last century. Even then they increased but slowly, until the close of the Revolutionary War. The census takers of 1790 reported 228,758 people on the Western waters, 63,518 in Pennsylvania, 55,873 in western Virginia, 73,677 in Kentucky, and 35,691 in Tennessee. In 1800 this population had increased to 584,728, and in 1810 to 1,279,172. The relative increase was even more significant. In 1790 the Western population was less than six per cent of that of the whole country, in 1800 more than eleven per cent, and in 1810 nearly eighteen per cent. For their numbers these people were remarkable for enterprise and force. In respect to markets and travel they had practically cut themselves off from the Atlantic seaboard by crossing the mountains. The only practicable roads were the Indian trails, which could be traveled only by pack horses, and by the trail so widened by the axe as to admit of the passage of wheeled vehicles. At the beginning of this century the best road from Philadelphia or Baltimore to Cincinnati lay through the Shenandoah Valley and Cumberland Gap, and so on through central Kentucky. Around the Western people lay inexhaustible quantities of virgin lands, as productive as any in the world, while their former occupations, habits, and tastes, as

well as the conditions of pioneer life, confined them to agricultural pursuits. Andrew Ellicott, Surveyor General of the United States, as he floated down the Ohio in 1796, observed that the country produced all the immediate necessities of life in quantities far beyond the consumption of the inhabitants, and that there was a large surplus of these necessities, together with hemp, cordage, whisky, apples, cider, and salted provisions. He also observed the lack of manufactures, of markets for materials, and the high prices of imported goods, and reflected that to these causes was due, in part, the character which had been given to the people as insurgents and disorganizers. Almost the only article that found a ready market at home and would command cash was distilled spirits.

But while Nature had thrust a mountain barrier between the Western people and the Atlantic seaboard, she had provided for them a grand water-way leading to the outside world. The markets of New Orleans, the Gulf coast, the West Indies, and the Atlantic States stood ready to take all the bulky but cheap commodities that the West could produce. Hence it was that Mr. Jefferson wrote, in 1802: "There is on the globe one single spot the possessor of which is our natural and habitual enemy. It is New Orleans, through which the products of three fifths of our territory must pass to market, and from its fertility it will ere long yield more than one half of our whole produce, and contain more than one half of our inhabitants." Mr. Madison did not exaggerate when he wrote about the same time that, to the people of the West, the Mississippi was everything. The Hudson, the Delaware, the Potomac, and all the navigable streams of the Atlantic States formed into one stream. But, unfortunately, the possession of the outlet of this great natural highway was in the possession of a foreign power.

After 1763 Spain owned the western side of the river and the island of New Orleans, and after 1783 she owned Florida also. Above the parallel of 31° the United States met Spain at the middle thread of the river, but below that

line they enjoyed no privileges except such as Spain saw fit to grant them.* Spain's old jealousy for the Gulf of Mexico had by no means burned out. The Mississippi was the great road from the Ohio Valley to Mexico, Florida, and the Gulf islands, as well as to New Orleans. In fact, Spain valued New Orleans mainly because she thought it essential to the security of possessions that she prized more highly. Although she declared war against England in 1779, she refused to enter into a treaty with the United States; in 1782 she strove to exclude the Republic from the Mississippi altogether; and when the war was over she not only disputed our southern boundary, and for years maintained troops within our territory, but refused to come to any understanding with regard to navigation and commerce. Sometimes the port of New Orleans was open to Americans, sometimes closed; and sometimes, as Mr. Cable has said, it was "neither closed nor open"—which means that it was open to preferred traders who were in collusion with the local Spanish authorities and closed to others. When a fleet of flatboats left the Ohio for the lower Mississippi, the men in charge could never certainly tell whether they would safely reach their destination and dispose of their commodities at remunerative prices, or whether the boats would be seized and their freight confiscated. As Surveyor-General Ellicott descended the river, even after the treaty of 1795, he was several times halted and detained by Spanish officers. The National Government could not for the time compel Spain to come to terms; and the Western people, or rather a portion of them, thinking the Government indifferent to their interests, and incited by restless and ambitious

* In 1763 France ceded to Great Britain the right to navigate the Mississippi in its whole breadth and length, from its source to the sea, and in 1782-'83 Great Britain and the United States agreed that the navigation of the river, from its source to the ocean, should forever remain free and open to the subjects of Great Britain and the citizens of the United States. But his Catholic Majesty denied absolutely that these treaties gave the United States any rights whatever below the thirty-first parallel.

spirits, sometimes thought of seceding from the Union, seizing the mouth of the Mississippi, and setting up for themselves, and sometimes of uniting their destiny with that of the Spaniards.

In 1795 Spain entered for the first time into treaty relations with the United States, the treaty being known as San Lorenzo. She now confirmed our southern and western boundaries, promised to withdraw her troops from our territory, opened the navigation of the river in its whole breadth, from its source to the ocean, to the citizens of the United States, and also granted them for three years the right to deposit and reship merchandise in the port of New Orleans without duty or charge other than a fair price for storage, promising also that she would, on the expiration of the time, assign some other place of deposit on the bank of the river. For a time matters now moved more smoothly ; but in 1798 the local authority suspended the right of deposit, and thus threw the West into a new ferment. The royal Government restored the right rather than incur the danger of war. Experience had now fully proved that the interests of the West could never be safe so long as a foreign power, even if as weak and placid as Spain, owned the mouth of the Mississippi.

In 1800 Bonaparte compelled Spain, by the treaty of San Ildefonso, to retrocede Louisiana to France. For a time the retrocession was kept secret, but on its becoming known in the United States it produced great excitement, and particularly in the West. President Jefferson wrote that France, owing to the impetuosity of her temper and the restlessness and energy of her character, would at New Orleans be in a point of eternal friction with the United States, and that permanent peace between the two powers would be impossible. He declared that the occlusion of the Mississippi was a state of things in which the United States could not exist ; that the river was so indispensable to them that they could not hesitate for one moment to hazard their existence for its maintenance ; and that whatever power other than them-

selves held the island of New Orleans was their natural enemy. The local Spanish authority, which was still in possession, added to the excitement by again withdrawing the right of deposit. Congress strove to meet the emergency by authorizing the purchase of the island for two million dollars, and Mr. Monroe was sent to Paris to assist Minister Livingston in the negotiation. But Bonaparte proposed instead to sell all Louisiana, which our Government hastened to purchase at the price of fifteen million dollars.

III. Florida.

The King of Spain gave up Louisiana to France simply because Bonaparte compelled him to do so. He regarded the province as an outwork of Mexico, and no other disposition could be made of it that would be so unwelcome to him as its transfer to the United States. Naturally, therefore, his Government at once set about confining the province within the narrowest possible limits.

The treaty of sale merely quoted the description contained in the treaty of San Ildefonso: "The colony or province of Louisiana with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it, and such as it should have after the treaties subsequently entered into between Spain and other states." What this extent was could be ascertained only by appealing to History, and her testimony was conflicting, as a brief recital will show.

On April 9, 1682, La Salle, having descended the Mississippi to its mouth, acting in the name of his royal master, King Louis XIV, of France, took formal possession of the region that he named Louisiana, and that he bounded as follows: "Extending from the mouth of the great river St. Louis, otherwise called the Ohio, as also along the river Colbert, or Mississippi, and the rivers which discharge themselves thereinto, from its source beyond the country of the Nadoussioux . . . as far as its mouth at the sea, or Gulf of Mexico, and also to the mouth of the River of Palms." This

vast territory, lying on the Gulf coast between the Mobile and the Rio Grande, and extending to the farthest sources of the Mississippi and of all its affluents, was the first Louisiana. Such were the boundaries laid down on Franquelin's great map of 1684.

La Salle based the claim that he made for France on discovery. But as the Pope had given all North America to Spain, and as Spaniards had discovered and explored portions of this very territory, that power held the act of La Salle an intrusion. In fact, she had long before declared the Gulf of Mexico a closed sea to all powers but herself. But Spain had lost her supremacy among the powers of Europe, and she was wholly unable to exclude France, which was now in the ascendant, from the Mississippi. La Salle's colony intended for the mouth of the Mississippi, either by accident or design, was set down on the Texas coast, far to the west, where it proved a disastrous failure. At the close of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth the Spanish viceroys of Mexico, acting under instructions, sent soldiers and colonists into Texas to hold it for the King of Spain. The French never returned to Texas, and it can not be said that they were ever in actual possession of the region between the Sabine and the Rio Grande. Still, no boundary between the French and Spanish possessions in the Southwest was ever agreed to, previous to the time when the French gave up their dominions in North America. On the east, however, the French settlements extended to the Mobile.

In 1763 the Mississippi Valley was cleft in twain. France drew a line through the middle of the river from its source to the Iberville, and from this point a line through the middle of the Iberville and Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain to the sea. All of her old dominions on the east side of this line she ceded to England, all on the west side to Spain. At the same time Spain ceded to England Florida. These acts limited Louisiana, save below the junction of the Mississippi and the Iberville, to the western side of

the great river. As Spain now owned the whole Southwest, extending to the Pacific Ocean, she had no motive to establish a boundary line between her old and her new possessions. Accordingly, the territory ceded by France to Spain in 1763 was the second Louisiana.

It is clear that the treaty of 1803 involved a contradiction of terms. French Louisiana had extended on the east to the Perdido, but Spanish Louisiana only to the Iberville and the lakes. That part of French Louisiana which passed to England in 1763 was immediately made a part of Florida. It is true that Spain recovered all Florida in 1783, but she denied that the part of Louisiana which England had received from France, and which she had regained twenty years later, was any part of the Louisiana that she retroceded to France in 1800. The United States claimed the coast to the Perdido, but Spain would yield only to the Iberville. On the west there was a similar dispute. Previous to 1763 France had regarded the Rio Grande the western limit of Louisiana, but Spain had claimed Texas, and in part occupied it. The common American view was that our rightful boundary on the west, after 1803, was the Rio Grande from mouth to source, and north of that the waterparting to the possessions of Great Britain. Spain, however, maintained her claim to Texas.

The acquisition of New Orleans left all the other Gulf ports in Spanish hands ; and this fact was so keenly felt by those more directly interested, that some suggested whether it would not be wise to exchange all Louisiana west of the Mississippi for the two Floridas. Important rivers that headed in the United States had their mouths in Spanish territory, thus presenting the Mississippi question over again on a smaller scale. Indians living on the Spanish side of the line, and also outlaws and desperadoes, committed outrages on the American side. To redress such wrongs General Jackson twice crossed the frontier at the head of an American army, once in 1814 and once in 1818. The Southern people, and particularly the Georgians, demanded, first,

that the Government at Washington should insist upon the Perdido boundary, and afterward that it should take steps to acquire east Florida, using force if necessary. And so the feeling continued to grow, and not unnaturally, that the possession of the whole Gulf coast east of the Mississippi was essential to the peace and security of the frontier and to the geographical completeness of the United States. Still more, the Spanish Government was indebted to American citizens in large sums on account of Spanish depredations committed on American commerce. These causes, including the serious disputes about boundaries, virtually forced our second extension of territory.

Spain retained possession of the coast east of the Iberville until 1810, when our Government took possession of the major part of the district that was in dispute. It also continued to press his Catholic Majesty for a settlement of all pending controversies, until in 1819 he sold Florida for five million dollars, the money to be applied to the payment of American claims, and also agreed to the following boundary line between the United States and Mexico on the southwest: The west bank of the Sabine River from the Gulf to parallel 32° , a due north line to Red River, the south bank of the Red River to longitude 100° west from Greenwich, this meridian to the Arkansas, the south bank of the Arkansas to its source, from this point south or north, as the case might be, to parallel 42° , and then along that parallel to the Pacific Ocean. This line left Texas on the Spanish side, and we may regard that province as a part of the purchase price paid for Florida.

The truth is, that what the United States really wished to buy in 1803 was the island of New Orleans and west Florida, and not the western half of the Mississippi Valley. At that stage of their development the Gulf coast from the mouth of the Mississippi to the Perdido was much more valuable to them than the region of the Missouri. They did not get all that they wanted. Furthermore, owing to the haste with which the negotiations were conducted, the concealment practiced by Bonaparte's Government, the vague-

ness of the old boundaries, and the uncertainty as to what actually passed from Spain to France, they did not clearly know what they were buying. For the time, therefore, the purchase proved something of a disappointment.

The causes that brought about the annexation of Louisiana and Florida lie upon the surface. In addition to the earth hunger of the Anglo-Saxon race,* we note the constant pressure southward and westward of a large and rapidly growing population, made aggressive by industrial and commercial necessities, and by natural and historical environment. The American did not like the Spaniard. As national boundaries, rivers yield to mountains. River valleys generally contain populations related by blood and history, while mountains often mark differences of race and civilization. In 1800 there were 585,000 Americans west of the Alleghany Mountains, while Louisiana did not contain more than 60,000 Frenchmen and Spaniards. In vigor, and in capacity for subduing and replenishing the Great West, the disparity between these two populations was greater than it was in numbers. Taking these facts into account, and also the geographical relations of the two halves of the Mississippi Valley to each other, and of the Gulf coast to the original United States, the annexation of Louisiana and Florida could not long remain doubtful. The treaty of 1803 restored the political unity of the great valley, and made the next annexation inevitable.

* Mr. Sumner, referring to the growth of our national dominion, once said: "It was land, not gold, that roused the Anglo-Saxon phlegm. I doubt, however, if this passion be stronger with us than with others, except, perhaps, that in a community where all participate in government the national sentiments are more active. It is common to the human family. There are few anywhere who could hear of a considerable accession of territory, obtained peacefully and honestly, without a pride of country, even if at certain moments the judgment hesitated. With increased size on the map there is increased consciousness of strength, and the heart of the citizen throbs anew as he traces the extending line."

IV. Texas.

Previous to 1819 the feeling was general, at least at the South and West, that the Louisiana purchase extended to the Rio Grande. Still, public opinion accepted the Sabine in its stead, since "the alienation of Texas," as some called it, was commonly counted a part of the price of Florida. But this acquiescence did not prevent the taking of immediate steps to secure that territory.

In 1821 occurred the revolution that led to the establishment of the republic of Mexico, of which Texas and Coahuila was one of the states. About the same time adventurous persons from the United States, mainly from the South, acting in concert with a political propaganda, began to found settlements in that state on lands obtained from the Mexican Government. Constantly re-enforced from the South and West, this population grew, until in 1836 the Texans seceded from Mexico and established the "Lone Star" republic. From the first, the men who promoted these movements looked to the ultimate incorporation of Texas into the United States; and after various attempts and failures that end was finally accomplished in 1845, thus correcting the "alienation" of 1819. This was done in pursuance of a joint resolution of Congress.

In this third annexation the old causes acted with undiminished power. The feeling prevailed that Nature and History had made Texas ours; the idea of reclamation also exerted an influence. But a new cause now declared itself. This was the need of the Slave Power for new territory out of which to make new slave States, as related in a future chapter. One of the conditions of the annexation of Texas was that it might be cut up into several States.

V. First Mexican Annexation.

Texas brought with her into the Union a quarrel. Mexico had never acknowledged her independence, and, what was more serious, did not acknowledge the western

boundaries that Texas claimed. Texas insisted that her right extended westward to the Rio Grande ; Mexico that hers extended eastward to the Nueces. The United States sent an army into the disputed territory to maintain the Texan claim. Mexico sent an army to defend her claim. In the war that ensued the United States forces not only held the territory lying between the two rivers, but also conquered New Mexico and Upper California, as previously related. From the beginning of hostilities our Government had made an acquisition of territory a principal object of the war, as "indemnity for the past and security for the future" ; and the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, entered into in 1848, secured to us the territories just named on the payment of fifteen million dollars. These were the new boundaries : The deepest channel of the Rio Grande from its mouth to the southern boundary of New Mexico, the southern and western boundaries of that territory to the river Gila, the Gila to the Colorado, and from their junction a line drawn across the Colorado and between Upper and Lower California to the Pacific Ocean.

VI. Second Mexican Annexation.

Soon there arose a dispute over the new boundary line in the Gila River region : both parties claimed the Mesilla Valley, in southern Arizona. For a time war seemed imminent, but in 1853 a treaty was negotiated by which the United States obtained a new accession of territory on payment of ten million dollars. This is sometimes called the "Gadsden Purchase," from General Gadsden, who negotiated the treaty on our part.

These two annexations were effected by the action of causes already enumerated, but the ambition of the Slave Power was the master motive. Still, not a foot of the soil acquired by the treaties of 1848 and 1853 ever became slave soil.

About the year 1730 Bishop Berkeley wrote his familiar

verses on the prospect of planting arts and learning in America, of which this is the best known stanza :

Westward the course of empire takes its way ;
 The first four acts already passed,
 A fifth shall close the drama with the day ;
 Time's noblest offspring is the last.

These lines expressed a sentiment that was more or less current before the American Revolution, and thus naturally became connected with the history of the United States. At the opening of the Revolution the American patriots adopted the names America and American, continent and continental. In part this language was due to the habit of large speech that prevailed at the time, but it was not without its influence on the course of events. In 1787 John Adams wrote that the United States were destined to spread over the northern part of that whole quarter of the globe. In 1823 President Monroe promulgated the Monroe doctrine, which was merely a notification to the Holy Alliance of Europe that the United States would regard any attempt of the powers composing it to control the destinies of the American states that had declared themselves independent of Spain as the manifestation of an unfriendly spirit toward themselves, but it was often assumed to be a promise of a sort of political protection or guardianship of the two Americas on the part of the United States. All these factors, energized by the spontaneous vigor of a free and growing people, culminated, about the time of the Mexican War, in what was called Manifest Destiny, or the belief which many people entertained, and which some statesmen fostered, that the republic was destined to occupy the continent.

VII. Oregon.

On no other part of the map of America do we find such a variety of geographical names as on the Northwest coast. Spanish, English, Greek, Dutch, Russian, German, and American names, to say nothing of native ones, jostle one

another. This diversity is typical of the diversity of nationalities that participated in exploration and discovery on that coast, and also helps to explain the conflicting titles that we are now to describe.

First, Spain claimed the coast from California to a high latitude, basing her right on numerous voyages of discovery that run back to the year 1543. At no time, however, did she plant colonies north of parallel 42°. Russia asserted a claim that extended far down the coast, resting it on discoveries, explorations, and trading operations. Sir Francis Drake visited the coast in 1580, Captain Cook in 1778, and Vancouver in 1793. These voyages gave England a color of title, but she rested her claim mainly on certain trading posts that fur traders, who came overland from Canada in 1793, 1806, and 1811, had established. Before this time, however, the country north of California had been named. The name Oregon is said to be the Spanish *Oregon*, "big ear"—"The designation in that language of a tribe of Indians living high up on the [Columbia] River, and chiefly known to us by the French name, Pends d'Oreilles, from the habit which they formerly had of enlarging the lobe of the ear to a monstrous size by the insertion of metal or wood into a cut made for that purpose." The Spaniards called the river that we now know as the Columbia, Rio de los Oregones, and from the river the name passed to the country that it drained. A familiar line of Bryant's *Thanatopsis* commemorates the first use of Oregon. In 1792 Captain Gray, of Boston, first entered the river, if he did not indeed first see it, and gave to it the patriotic name of his ship, The Columbia. In due time Columbia superseded Oregon as the name of the river, but not as the name of the country.

The claim of the United States to territory on the Northwest coast originated in Captain Gray's discovery. In 1803-1806 Captains Lewis and Clarke, United States officers, acting under the direction of President Jefferson, crossed the Rocky Mountains and explored the valley of the Columbia south of parallel 49°. It is noteworthy that this expe-

dition was organized before the purchase of Louisiana. In 1811 Mr. Astor established at the mouth of the Columbia the trading post that he named Astoria. In 1819 Spain ceded to the United States all her right and title to territory north of the forty-second parallel. In 1824 Russia agreed not to make settlements south of $54^{\circ} 40'$, and the United States agreed not to make them north of that line, and the ensuing year Russia and England entered into similar engagements. These treaties fixed the boundaries of Oregon on the north and on the south, and also excluded Spain and Russia from the further competition for its ownership, thus leaving the United States and England to settle that question between themselves. The United States claimed the whole region between those parallels west of the mountains, while England asserted that she also had rights there, although she did not claim an exclusive ownership. The two powers not being able to agree, and the question not being then a pressing one, the treaty of 1818, which made the forty-ninth parallel the boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Stony Mountains, provided that for ten years Oregon should be open to the citizens and subjects of both alike, without prejudice to the claims of either. In 1828 this joint occupancy was extended indefinitely, with the proviso that either nation might terminate it by giving a year's notice to the other. About 1832 American citizens began to make settlements in the valley of the Columbia, and by 1845 they had become three thousand in number and were constantly increasing. A boundary had now become imperative; and in 1846 it was agreed that the parallel of 49° from the Rocky Mountains to the channel between Vancouver's Island and the mainland, and a line drawn through the middle of this channel and the Strait of Fuca, should be the line of demarcation, with free navigation of the channel and of the Columbia to both parties. Later, a difference arose as to the identity of the main channel—a question that the Emperor of Germany, as an arbitrator, decided in our favor in 1872.

The title of the United States to the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, between the forty-second and forty-ninth parallels of latitude, is made up of the following facts : 1, Gray's discovery of the Columbia in 1792 ; 2, Lewis and Clarke's explorations, 1803-1806 ; 3, the founding of Astoria in 1811 ; 4, the Spanish treaty of 1819 ; 5, the Russian treaty of 1824 ; 6, the settlements made in the period 1832-1846 ; 7, the treaty of 1846 ; 8, the treaty of 1872, under which the Emperor William rendered his decision. It should be added that the representatives of the United States, in pressing our claims upon England, laid stress upon contiguity—that is, the fact that the geographical relations of Oregon to the abutting territory east of the mountains formed a quasi title. It should be further observed that the statement sometimes made to the effect that Oregon was a part of the Louisiana purchase is without foundation ; all books and maps making such a representation are misleading.*

Slavery played no direct part in the Oregon contest. Owing to the influence of the Slave Power in national affairs in those years, manifest destiny was less active at the North than at the South. In domestic discussions more or less was said about the Monroe doctrine. It was alleged that to yield any part of Oregon to England would be consenting to the formation of a new American colony in North America, and that as a next-door neighbor. However, this was not the first time that jealousy of England had played a part in the extension of American territory. It was seri-

* Mr. Jefferson wrote to Mellish, a map-maker, in 1816 : "The western boundary of Louisiana is, rightfully, the Rio Bravo (its main stream), from its mouth to its source, and thence along the highlands and mountains dividing the waters of the Mississippi from the waters of the Pacific. . . . On the waters of the Pacific we can found no claim in right of Louisiana." — *Works*, vol. vii., p. 51. M. Marbois, who negotiated the treaty of 1803 on the part of France, wrote as follows in his *History of Louisiana* : "The shores of the Western ocean were certainly not included in the cession, but the United States are already established there."—*English Translation*, p. 286.

ously feared, in 1803, that in the event of war between England and France the mouth of the Mississippi would fall into her hands. It was also charged, prior to 1845, that she was intriguing for Texas ; and, in 1846, fear that she would pounce upon Upper California hastened its occupation by the forces of the United States.

VIII. Alaska.

Bering, a German navigator in the Russian service, discovered the strait that bears his name in 1728, and the North American continent in latitude $58^{\circ} 28'$ in 1741. The title to the region that these discoveries gave to Russia was duly completed by further discoveries and by a sort of occupancy that Senator Sumner thus described in 1867 : " Her Government is little more than a name or a shadow. It is not even a skeleton. It is hardly visible. Its only representative is a fur company, to which has been added latterly an ice company." The total population of Russians and creoles at that time was estimated at 3,500. The limitation on the south, established in 1824 and 1825, has been already described.

The idea of the accession of Russian America to the United States was broached, it is said, in the administration of President Polk. It was more seriously considered in the administration of President Buchanan. A considerable interest in the scheme was manifested on the Pacific slope at the close of the Civil War, particularly in Washington Territory, and on March 30, 1867, a treaty of cession was concluded at Washington, the United States agreeing to pay seven million two hundred thousand dollars for Russia's right and title. On the east the line of demarcation between Russia and Great Britain, established in 1825, was followed, viz. : A line drawn from the southern point of island Prince of Wales, in parallel $54^{\circ} 40'$, northward along Portland Channel to 56° north latitude, but giving the whole of the island to the United States ; a line from this point following the summit of the mountains, running parallel to the

coast, to the meridian 141° west, provided that said line should never be more than ten marine leagues from the shore, and then the meridian 141° to the frozen ocean.* The western boundary runs southwest through Bering Strait and Bering Sea to the meridian of 172° west, and thence southwesterly to the meridian of 193° west, so as to include in the territory conveyed the whole of the Aleutian Islands east of that meridian. Mr. Sumner proposed the name Alaska, the native name for the American continent, but at the time appropriated to the great southwestern peninsula.

Those who advocated this purchase laid much stress upon the China and Japan trade, and especially upon its advantages to our Pacific coast. Conviction had for some time been growing that the Pacific Ocean was to play a new part in the life of the world. President Garfield, for example, was fond of calling it "the historic sea of the future." The opening of the Suez Canal, the building of the Panama Railroad, the projected canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the building of the several contemplated lines of Pacific railroads, promised to give to the great commerce of the world more of an east-and-west movement. Much was said at the time about the so-called "commercial equator." Men who shared these large views generally thought it highly desirable that the United States, from their geographical position, should control as much of the western shore of North America as possible. It is significant that the purchase of Alaska practically coincided with the opening of the Union and Central Pacific Railroads and the negotiation of the treaty establishing closer relations with China, in 1868. Extension of dominion was also dwelt upon. Another favorite argument was the extension of republican institutions. Mr. Sumner, it has been said, was unwilling to miss the opportunity of dismissing another European sover-

* Commissioners appointed by the United States and Great Britain are now engaged in surveying their joint boundary.

eign from our continent, predestined, as he believed, to become the broad, undivided home of the American people. Still other arguments were a desire to anticipate England, that some believed was ready to move in the same direction, and a feeling of amity toward Russia because she had been friendly to the National cause in the Civil War. The territory was also considered valuable on account of its resources of lumber and timber, minerals, fisheries, and furs.

Since the annexation of Alaska keen regrets have been expressed that the United States did not in 1846 insist upon the line of $54^{\circ} 40'$. It has been predicted that the gap between our territories on that coast will some day be closed. At the time of his visit to the Pacific coast, in 1869, Mr. Seward said: "Although British Columbia remains . . . subject to a European monarchy, I nevertheless found existing there commercial and political forces which render a permanent political separation of British Columbia from Alaska and Washington Territory impossible."

In the preceding sketch nothing has been said about the character and necessities of the nations with which we have dealt. Bonaparte sold Louisiana without regard either to the resident population, which was strongly adverse to the transfer, or to the French people. It was solely his act. Spain was very jealous of her American possessions, but she was degenerate, and wholly unable to resist the constant and growing pressure upon those possessions from the north and east. Much the same may be said of Mexico: she was forced to submit to the inevitable. Russia appears never to have regarded her distant American possessions as a real part of her system; besides, rumors of war were afloat in 1867, and she naturally preferred the purchase money to the precarious ownership of a distant and unprofitable dependency. In every case the condition of the power with which we have had to deal has been favorable to our wishes. On the side of Canada, where we have constantly faced a great and ambitious imperial power, we have never extended

our boundaries a single foot. On this side, however, it must be said that the necessities of our material development have not hitherto required territorial enlargement; the logic of events has moved rather southward and westward. Still it is easy to see that had we been bounded on the west and south, in 1783, by Great Britain rather than by Spain, the results would have been somewhat different. We should have reached the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific, no doubt, but at the expense of more time and effort.

*The Area of the United States, with Dates of Acquisition.**

	Sq. miles.	Dates.
1. Original United States.....	819,815	1783
2. Louisiana purchase.....	877,268	1803
3. Oregon.....	284,828	1792, 1805, 1811, 1819, 1846, 1872
4. The Floridas.....	64,030	1819
5. Texas.....	262,290	1845
6. First Mexican annexation.....	614,439	1848
7. Second Mexican annexation.....	47,330	1853
8. Alaska.....	531,409	1867
Total.....	3,501,509

Mr. Gladstone once described our territory as "a natural base for the greatest continuous empire ever established by man."

* The authority for this table is Prof. A. B. Hart, of Harvard University. See "The Disposition of our Public Land," Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. i., pp. 169, 251. The areas differ more or less widely from those given in the Government publications. The principal discrepancy, however, arises from the fact that the Government officers persist in including Oregon in the Louisiana purchase. See the Statistical Atlas, 1874, and The Public Domain, 1882. Reclus gives statistics still different. The United States, p. 5.

CHAPTER XXI.

PHASES OF INDUSTRIAL AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT.

References.—Washington: Writings of, edited by Sparks (Letters to Chastellux, VIII., 488, Jefferson, IX., 31, Harrison, id., 58, and Lee, id., 117); H. B. Adams: Maryland's Influence upon Land Cessions to the United States; Henry Adams: The Life of Albert Gallatin; Gannett and Hewes: Scribner's Statistical Atlas; Walker: Statistical Atlas of the United States, Ninth Census; Johnston: Political History of the United States, Lalor's Cyclopædia of Political Science (Internal Improvements, The Cumberland Road, Construction, State Sovereignty, Federal Party, Democratic-Republican Party); Jeans: Water Ways and Water Transport (Sec. I., Chap. XIV.); Sumner: Lectures on the History of Protection in the United States; Taussig: Tariff History of the United States; Ford: Lalor's Cyclopædia (Tariffs in the United States); Hildreth: History of the United States, Vol. V., Chap. XV.

BUT few years of American history, counting even from Jamestown and Plymouth, have been years of war. While some of the wars in which the country has been engaged hold an important place in history, its genius is still essentially civil and pacific. The United States are an industrial, commercial, and political nation rather than a martial one. The lessons that they teach the world are mainly lessons of peace. No historical studies of the kind can be more profitable or interesting to the American student than those that deal with this characteristic side of the national development. It is therefore to be regretted that disproportionate attention is so often given to the military side of our history. In the present work, however, nothing more can be

attempted than to sketch some of the leading features of this field of study. We may first look at the establishment of means of communication between the several divisions of the country.

In the colonial period the sea and its tributaries were large factors in travel and transportation. The great length of the sea front, the shallow depth of the Atlantic slope, and the number and distribution of navigable rivers, together with the undeveloped state of the country, furnish the ready explanation. Vermont, admitted to the Union in 1791, was the first inland State. Roads were poor, and the most important ones connected the rivers and other bodies of navigable water. A man could journey on horseback from Providence to Savannah—one thousand two hundred and forty-three miles—in seventy days, spending every night in some town furnishing comfortable accommodations. Previous to the French and Indian War the only persons who passed and repassed the mountains that shut in the Atlantic Plain on the west were hunters and Indian traders, who followed paths that the deer and the buffalo had made through the passes. Naturally enough, these adventurers were found at the southward; for, although the Pennsylvanians and the Virginians were confronted by the continuous parallel ridges of the Alleghanies, they were much nearer the Great West than the New Englanders or the people of New York, while they were not exposed to the jealousy of the Six Nations or the competition of the French. English-speaking men chased game in the valley of the Tennessee much sooner than on the shore of the Great Lakes. The Ohio Valley was far better known to them in 1755 than the Lake Erie Basin.

No country in the world offers to man better facilities for inland navigation than the United States, or at least that portion of it lying between the Appalachian and Cordilleran mountain systems. In addition to the abundance of navigable waters, Nature opposes no serious obstacles to connecting the several river systems or parts of systems; while the

problems offered to the engineer and capitalist by the mountains themselves, although serious, are not insuperable. The eastern mountain system offered the first great problem of the kind that the country solved.

The first road through the forests that clothed the Alleghanies was cut by Braddock's troops, from Cumberland to the Monongahela, in 1755 ; the second one by Forbes's troops, from the upper Susquehanna to the forks of the Ohio, in 1758. At the close of the Revolution the only real thoroughfare to the West was the road leading from Philadelphia to Pittsburg, the western part of which was the Forbes road. Before the opening of the Erie Canal the major part of the freight conveyed between tide water and the West was hauled over this road in Conestoga wagons, at a cost of one hundred and twenty dollars a ton. Pittsburg was the most important Western town, and the first inland manufacturing center in the whole country. In 1796 no road had been opened between the Mohawk and Lake Erie ; Canandaigua was the western outpost on what soon became a great line of travel. The surveyors of the Connecticut Land Company, on their way to the Western Reserve in the spring of that year, having rendezvoused at Schenectady, ascended the Mohawk to Fort Stanwix, now Rome, whence they passed with their boats and stores over the portage to Wood Creek, and then proceeded by that stream, Oneida Lake, and Oswego River to Lake Ontario, from which point they made their way by water to Niagara, and then by the Indian trail to the present site of Buffalo. A large part of the New England emigration to northern Ohio crossed the Hudson at Fishkill and the Delaware at Easton, and reached their destination by the Pennsylvania route. Farther to the south Nature had anticipated man. The Wilderness Road led through the Valley of Virginia and Cumberland Gap, uniting the Potomac and the Tennessee, and even at the beginning of this century it furnished the most desirable route for the traveler from Philadelphia or Baltimore to Cincinnati or Louisville.

The early population of the West was distributed by the

rivers far more than by all other agencies. The hunter and the trader used the horse and the pack train as well as the canoe and the bateau, but the emigrant, as a rule, followed the water courses. Arrived at the Ohio or the Tennessee, the Great West was spread out before him. All the early towns were built on rivers. The river craft that appear so picturesque in the letters and diaries of tourists and emigrants of a literary turn, such as the "ark" and the "keel boat," were the sole means of transportation for both goods and persons until the advent of steam navigation. The first steamboat to descend the Mississippi reached New Orleans in 1811; the first to ascend Lake Erie reached Detroit in 1818. But the steamboat only increased the emigrants' immediate dependence upon the rivers. The second transportation question in the West was the crossing of the water partings dividing different systems of waters, or different branches of the same system; and this was accomplished for the time, first by utilizing and then by improving the trails across the portages over which the Indian, and often the Frenchman, had shouldered his canoe. In that period of history small streams often had an importance that it is now hard to understand, while small posts buried in forests were sometimes ports of entry. Upon the whole, it would be hard to exaggerate the part that navigable waters, and particularly the steamboat, played in the development of the West.

Lines of communication that should connect the Atlantic seaboard and the interior of the continent occupied the attention of far-seeing men many years before the States declared their independence. The question engaged the mind of Washington while he was still a youth. In 1754 he wrote a report on the navigation of the Potomac, and in 1770 he urged that subject upon the Governor of Maryland. He saw in the Potomac and the portage to the Ohio "a means of becoming the channel of conveyance of the extensive and valuable trade of a rising empire." He interested himself in the Potomac and James River Improvement Companies,

and he wrote to Mr. Jefferson, in 1784, that the plan which embraced those works was in a relatively good train when he went to Cambridge to assume command of the army, and would have been in an excellent way had it not been for the opposition of the Baltimore merchants, who dreaded the consequences of water transportation to Georgetown. The war put an end to all plans for the time.

The leadership of Virginia in the work of internal improvement on a large scale is easily explained. It was due to the close geographical and commercial connections of that State with the West, to the development of her industrial system, and the prescience of her statesmen. Still, citizens of New York were already stirred by similar thoughts. In the spring of 1776 General Schuyler explained to Dr. Franklin, who was one of the commission of three that Congress had dispatched to Canada, and that Schuyler assisted to cross the portage from the Hudson to Lake Champlain, that an uninterrupted water-carriage between New York and Quebec might be perfected at fifty thousand pounds sterling expense.

The war was hardly over before Washington took up the subject again. In July, 1783, while the army was disbanding, in company with Governor Clinton, he examined the portages between the Mohawk and the Susquehanna on the one side and Lake Ontario on the other. "Prompted by these actual observations," he wrote, "I could not help taking a more extensive view of the vast inland navigation of these United States from maps and the information of others." He desired to extend his visit to the Niagara, but desisted because the British still held that frontier. He declared that he should not rest contented until he "had explored the Western country, and traversed those lines, or a great part of them, which have given bounds to a new empire." This pledge he redeemed in September, 1784, when he made his last visit to the West, his object being not so much to look after his own property interests in those regions as to study on the ground the portages uniting the

Potomac and the James with the Ohio and Kanawha.* On his return he sketched out lines of communication between those rivers, and also between the Ohio and the Cuyahoga, and the mouth of the Cuyahoga and Detroit. His letters written at this period are a magazine of information relating to this interesting subject.

To the mind of Washington industrial and commercial reasons had ceased to be the strongest ones for carrying out his plans. He emphasized the swelling volume of emigration, and particularly the weakness of the ties which, in that time of disorganizing tendencies, bound the Western population, under the conditions of Western life, to the Union. In his famous letter to Governor Harrison, written soon after his return from the Ohio, he argued that the flanks and rear of the United States were possessed by other powers, and formidable ones too; that it was necessary to apply the cement of interest to bind all parts of the Union together by indissoluble bonds, especially the Ohio Valley and the Middle States. He pointed out how discontented those people would be, and what troubles might be apprehended if Spain and Great Britain should hold out lures for their trade and alliance. The Western States stood upon a pivot; the touch of a feather would turn them any way. They had looked down the Mississippi until the Spaniards threw

* "Wherever he came, he sought and closely questioned the men famed for personal observation of the streams and paths on each side of the Alleghanies. From Fort Cumberland he took the usual road over the mountains to the valley of the Yohogany, and studied closely the branches of that stream. The country between the Little Kanawha and the James River being at that moment infested with hostile Indians, he returned through the houseless solitude between affluents of the Cheat River and of the Potomac. As he traced the way for commerce over that wild region, he was compelled to pass a night on a rough mountain side in a pouring rain, with no companion but a servant and no protection but his cloak; one day he was without food; sometimes he could find no path except the track of buffaloes; and in unceasing showers his ride through the close bushes seemed to him little better than the swimming of rivulets."—*Bancroft, History of the United States (author's last revision), vol. vi, pp. 125, 126.*

difficulties in their way ; and they looked that way for no other reason than because they could glide gently down the stream, and because they had no means of carrying on trade with the East but by long land transportation and unimproved roads. These causes had hitherto checked the industry of the settlers ; but “smoothe the road,” he said, “and make easy the way for them, and then see what an influx of articles will be poured upon us ; how amazingly our exports will be increased by them, and how amply we shall be compensated for any trouble and expense we may encounter to effect it !”

Washington was more than willing to defer for the time the navigation of the Mississippi, which was then denied by Spain, assigning as his reasons that, until a little time had been allowed to open and make easy the ways between the Atlantic States and the Western territory, the obstructions to this navigation had better remain. Without the cement of interest the Western inhabitants could have no predilection for the Union, and a commercial connection was the only tie that would bind them. It was clear to him that the trade of the lakes and of the river Ohio as low as the Kanawha, if not the Falls, might be brought to the Atlantic ports easier and cheaper than it could be carried to New Orleans ; but let trade with that city be well established, and it would be found to be no easy matter to divert it ; and *vice versa*. When the settlements were stronger and more extended to the westward, the navigation of the Mississippi would be an object of importance, and we should then be able, reserving our claims, to speak a more efficacious language than policy for the time dictated.

Interest in internal improvements grew with the population and wealth of the country. In 1792 the Legislature of New York chartered two companies, one to build a canal with locks from the Mohawk to Lake Ontario, the other to bind together in a similar way the Hudson and Lake Champlain. In 1808 Mr. Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, laid before the Senate, in response to a resolution that it had

adopted, an elaborate scheme of internal improvements to be undertaken by Congress, the grand features of which Mr. Adams has classified as follows :

I. Those parallel with the seacoast, viz., canals cutting Cape Cod, New Jersey, Delaware, and North Carolina, so as to make continuous inland navigation along the coast to Cape Fear, at an estimated cost of \$3,000,000; and a great turnpike road from Maine to Georgia, at an estimated cost of \$4,800,000.

II. Those that were to run east and west, viz., improvement of the navigation of four Atlantic rivers, the Susquehanna, the Potomac, the James, and the Santee, and of four corresponding Western rivers, the Alleghany, the Monongahela, the Kanawha, and the Tennessee, to the highest practicable points, at an estimated cost of \$1,500,000; and the connection of these highest points of navigation by four roads across the Appalachian range, at an estimated cost of \$2,800,000; and, finally, a canal at the falls of the Ohio, \$300,000, and improvement of roads to Detroit, St. Louis, and New Orleans, \$200,000.

III. Those that were to run north and northwest to the lakes, viz., to connect the Hudson River with Lake Champlain, \$800,000; to connect the Hudson River with Lake Ontario at Oswego by canal, \$2,200,000; a canal round Niagara Falls, \$1,000,000.

IV. Local improvements. \$3,400,000.

The entire estimated expense was \$20,000,000. By an appropriation of \$2,000,000 a year the whole might be accomplished in ten years. By a system of selling to private parties the stock thus created by the Government for turnpikes and canals, the fund might be made itself a permanent resource for further improvements.

This scheme is interesting for numerous reasons. It shows careful study of the physiography of the country, and a firm grasp of its industrial and commercial needs and relations, and evinces a remarkable anticipation of enterprises that have in some form been accomplished. It is not a little remarkable, moreover, that neither Gallatin nor his predecessors projected a line of communication from the Hudson direct to Lake Erie—the more remarkable as it was by this very route that the first line to the West was actually

constructed. The obvious cause of the omission was the strong hold that natural water courses, as means of conveyance, then had upon men's minds ; it was assumed that the northern line to the West would run from the Mohawk to Lake Ontario, and then to the mouth of the Niagara River, around the falls of which Gallatin's scheme did provide a canal.

The great difficulty and cost of transporting troops and military stores to the West in the War of 1812 taught the country that war, as well as peace, required that the seaboard and the interior should be more closely connected. The danger of a Western secession had passed away since Washington's day ; the annexation of Louisiana had more than doubled the national area, but Great Britain and Spain were still on our flanks and rear, and there was no telling how soon we might become involved in war with either power. Several great lines of communication were soon taken in hand, New York leading the way.

In 1823 the Delaware and Hudson Canal, uniting the Hudson and Lake Champlain, was completed ; in 1825, the Erie Canal, uniting the Hudson and Lake Erie. The completion of the second of these works contributed amazingly to the development of the West on the one hand, while it made the State of New York the Empire State, and the city of New York the metropolis of the country on the other. Next came a line of canal and railroad connecting Philadelphia and Pittsburg. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, begun in 1828, reached Cumberland in 1850 and there stopped ; nor was the canal from the James to the Kanawha ever finished.

In the West, as in the East, the canal problem was to unite different river systems ; no one thought of competing directly with navigable rivers or lakes. In Ohio and Indiana the great canal lines connected Lake Erie and the Ohio River ; in Illinois and Wisconsin, Lake Michigan and the Mississippi. A canal was projected across the lower Michigan peninsula, but never built. By the time that the

States beyond the Mississippi were ready for public improvements the canal-boat period had ceased and the locomotive period had begun.

In its largest features the early railroad system resembled the canal system. The great trunk lines, as the New York Central, the Erie, and Pennsylvania roads, led to the West. The Baltimore and Ohio road, which reached the Ohio in 1850, fulfilled the ideas of Washington ; one of its branches extending from Cumberland to Pittsburg, the other to Parkersburg and Wheeling. In the Old Northwest also Nature surveyed the railway lines. In Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin, the first roads bound together the lakes on the one side and the Ohio and the Mississippi on the other. The Michigan roads connecting the waters east and west are much older than the roads running north and south. South of the Ohio the first necessity was to unite that river with the Tennessee, the Cumberland, and the Gulf of Mexico. Between the Mississippi and the Missouri, it was to unite those rivers. Beyond the Missouri and in the Southwest the great railroads have sought the Pacific Ocean.

At first it was confidently assumed that the railroad train could not compete with the steamboat for either freight or passengers, or with the canal boat for heavy freight—an assumption which explains why, for example, Cleveland was connected by roads with both Pittsburg and Cincinnati earlier than with either Buffalo or Toledo. But as the value of rapid transit became more and more apparent, and the cost of railroad communication was gradually reduced, these ideas were thrown aside ; and to-day it would not be easy to find an important river or lake shore that has not been paralleled by one or more lines of road.

No inventions proclaim a greater triumph of man over Nature than those which enable him to utilize the power of steam. The steamship defies wind and wave.

The pulses of her iron heart
Go beating through the storm.

The locomotive engine emancipates man from dependence upon water courses, natural and artificial. At first the locomotive like the canal boat followed the van of civilization at a distance ; but in the later period, striking through unpeopled regions, it has led the march. In the more recent westward movements of population the engineer and the contractor have literally been pioneers for the emigrant. As a result, natural means of transportation are no longer necessary for the existence or prosperity of cities. For example, a few years ago the export of cotton from the port of New Orleans had fallen from 70 to 22 per cent of the total export of the country, while the import of coffee had fallen from 80 to 7 per cent. The locomotive had built up rivals for the Metropolis of the Southwest. A distinguished economist has announced that a Massachusetts mechanic can pay for the transportation of a year's supply of food one thousand miles with the proceeds of one day's labor. The introduction of electricity, especially if it should become practicable to transport power long distances, may redress the balance of water and steam in respect to stationary machinery ; but for purposes of land transportation the victory of steam is apparently irreversible.

In course of time internal improvements became a great political question. Beginning with the act authorizing the construction of the Cumberland Road, passed in 1806, Congress voted large sums of money for turnpikes, canals, river improvements, and railroads. For some years no constitutional objection was heard ; President Madison was the first to raise that issue, in 1817. At a later day the subject entered deeply into party politics, the Whigs taking the affirmative and the Democrats the negative side of the question. Since that division, however, Senators and Representatives have often deferred to State or local interests in defiance of party creeds.

While party policy, the personal ends of politicians, and sheer accident have played their part in the tariff history of the country, that interesting subject can be understood only

when studied in connection with certain general causes and conditions that revealed themselves at an early day and continue to exist to the present time. The moderate protection given to certain industries in 1789 provoked little opposition from any quarter ; nor was there any organized resistance to the various extensions of the principle that were made down to 1816. Partly in consequence of the stimulus that protection had afforded, partly in consequence of the restrictions on commerce that finally culminated in the War of 1812, there was in those years a considerable growth of manufactures. Capital that had been invested in shipping and trade was now employed in production. As the return of peace and the re-establishment of commercial relations with Europe threatened disaster to the new industries, an act was passed increasing both the number and the amount of protective duties. About this time public opinion began to crystallize, and four great interests progressively declared themselves in the field of tariff legislation.

1. The manufacturing interest favored protection to home industries as a matter of course, meaning by that phrase not merely the capitalists who owned the manufactories, but also the laborers employed in them, and other classes, such as tradesmen, who were directly dependent upon them. Still further, as manufacturing depended upon certain conditions, as power agents, capital, raw material, labor, and superintendence, the protective doctrine tended strongly to root itself in particular States and districts of country where these conditions were found.

2. The shipping and importing interests, with the classes dependent directly upon them, tended toward a revenue tariff, or what is commonly called free trade. A large development of home production would tend to lessen the demand for foreign products, and so reduce commerce. Again, shipping and commercial interests depended also upon certain natural and economical causes, as navigable waters, ports, ship timber and shipyards, shipbuilders and sailors. As New England was much more interested in commerce and

shipping than in manufactures, her Senators and Representatives, led by Mr. Webster, voted against the act of 1816 by a strong majority. But at a later day New England ranged herself decisively on the protective side. Mr. Webster, who went with his section, defended the change when the tariff of 1828 was under discussion by alleging that the tariffs of 1816 and 1824 had led New Englanders to invest great amounts of capital in manufactures, which could be protected against loss or destruction only by continuing and strengthening the protective policy.

Nothing could be more natural than this divergence of the manufacturing and commercial classes. On the subject of protection, a great manufacturing city like Philadelphia and a great commercial city like New York, would be quite certain to go different roads.

3. The planting interest strongly supported the act of 1816. Southern statesmen, as Mr. Calhoun, argued that it was necessary to promote domestic manufactures in order that the country might be prepared for war; they also hoped that protection would stimulate manufactures, and particularly cotton manufactures at the South. In a few years, however, a change came over the Southern mind; the planters had learned that manufactories could not thrive in the midst of slavery; they realized keenly that they must buy the bulk of the goods that they needed either of Europe or at the North; and as they believed that protection enhanced prices they declared in favor of free trade. Still more, they feared that European nations would, in the spirit of retaliation for the high American duties, levy taxes upon the American cotton that they imported, thus reducing its price at home. How great the change of opinion was, is shown by the fact that in 1832 South Carolina nullified laws similar to one that only sixteen years before she had warmly supported. But into nullification there also entered deeply sectional and personal views and feelings that are beyond the present purpose.

4. The agricultural districts have not pursued an alto-

gether even course on protection. The great agricultural States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky voted for the act of 1816; they desired protection for their iron, wool, hemp, and flax. The belief was also common in those States that although protection might enhance the prices of protected articles, yet it would bring a compensation in the form of an enlarged home market for domestic products, as for the farmer's grain and meat. The agricultural States occupied much the same position in 1824, but afterward they wavered or changed ground.

Thus, of the three great interests that protection may be said to antagonize, commerce was the first and farming the last to array itself in opposition.*

It was many years before the constitutional right of Congress to lay protective duties was denied, or before such duties became a party question. The Democratic party, when reorganized under General Jackson, took up the line of free trade; the Whig party, which then appeared in opposition, the line of protection. The geographical strength of the two parties, so far as it was affected by the tariff, turned mainly upon the business interests of localities, which again depended upon natural and economical causes. The protective sentiment in Kentucky was due as much, perhaps, to the interest of the State in dew-rotted hemp as to the admiration of Kentuckians for their great fellow-citizen Henry Clay. The link that bound Louisiana to the Whigs was sugar cane. In Pennsylvania the situation was most anomalous. From the beginning that State was strongly protectionist. Her mines of coal, iron, and limestone turned her in that direction as strongly as the rice swamps and cot-

* Prof. Sumner gives this account of the situation on the passing of the Act of 1828: "New England and the Adams men wanted high duties on woollens and cottons, and low duties on wool, iron, hemp, salt, and molasses (the raw material of rum). Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky wanted high taxes on iron, wool, hemp, molasses (protection to whisky), and low taxes on the raw materials used. The Southerners wanted low taxes on everything, but especially on finished goods."

ton fields of South Carolina turned her in the opposite one. And yet Pennsylvania commonly cast her electoral votes for Democratic Presidents.

At present it is common to describe the Republican party as protectionist, the Democratic party as free trade. But special causes acting in certain States or districts sometimes bring the two parties together upon that issue. General Garfield said, in the House of Representatives in 1870 : " West of Ohio, north of Arkansas, and east of the Rocky Mountains, there are nine States represented here, all of them Republican, some of them overwhelmingly Republican in politics. Yet if I understand correctly the opinions of the fifty-seven Democratic and Republican Representatives in this House from those nine States, there are at least fifty of them who are in favor of some reduction in the present rates of our tariff."

We may now take a view of another group of political effects caused by natural forces working through industrial and social life. Soon after 1789 the country divided politically on the subject of constitutional interpretation, the Federalists emphasizing the National element, the Republicans the State element of our dual system of government. As Mr. Hildreth characterizes the two parties, " The Federal party, with Washington and Hamilton at its head, represented the experience, the prudence, the practical wisdom, the discipline, the conservative reason and instinct of the country. The opposition, headed by Jefferson, expressed its hopes, wishes, theories, many of them enthusiastic and impracticable, more especially its passions, its sympathies and antipathies, its impatience of restraint." The geographical distribution of two parties answering to these descriptions could hardly fail to be instructive. " The Federalists," Mr. Hildreth proceeds, " had their strength in those narrow districts where a concentrated population had produced and contributed to maintain that complexity of institutions and that reverence for social order which, in proportion as men are brought into contiguity, become more absolutely neces-

saries of existence"; while "the ultra democratical ideas of the opposition prevailed in all that more extensive region in which the dispersion of population and the despotic authority vested in individuals over families of slaves kept society in a state of immaturity, and made legal restraints the more irksome in proportion as their necessity was the less felt."

With such an analysis as this before him, any student who is familiar with the general condition of the country at the close of the last century could with measurable correctness indicate, without historical investigation, where the two parties would have their principal strength. New England, Delaware, Maryland, and for a time South Carolina, constituted the strength of Federalism; Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, the strength of Republicanism. The decision between the two, as the same writer tells us, "depended on the two great and growing States of Pennsylvania and New York; and from the very fact that they were growing, that both of them had an extensive backwoods frontier, and that both were constantly receiving accessions of political enthusiasts from Europe, they both inclined more and more to the Republican side." In a word, it was the rapid growth of the West, and of those States and parts of States where society most closely resembled the West, that, more than anything else, caused the downfall of the Federal party. Moreover, it was a clear perception of this tendency, and of the loss of political consequence that the growth of the West would cause the New England States, which led the Federalists of that section, as a class, to look with jealousy or hostility upon the West, and to oppose any acquisition of territory out of which additional States could be made.

Still the contentions of the Federalists and the Republicans were not over the barren abstraction of a strong or a weak government, but over practical living questions; and an examination of these questions, one by one, confirms the general view already advanced.

The first political measures to arouse the country were Hamilton's propositions that the National Government should assume the debts that the States had contracted in carrying on the war, that it should then fund the consolidated public debt, and that it should create a National bank commensurate with the financial affairs of the Government and with the business affairs of the country. These were all propositions that conservative communities, molded by industrial and commercial ideas and habits, and possessing more than their proportional share of wealth, would naturally favor, and that agricultural and planting districts, less wealthy and less schooled in the ways of commerce, would as naturally oppose. Then, upon the breaking out of the French Revolution, England and France became the leaders of the conservative and reactionary and of the innovating and revolutionary influences of Europe and of the world. For more than twenty years this issue was closely drawn, and it could not fail to enlist the interests and the passions of the great body of the American people. Still more, while Federalists might condemn the arbitrary course that England often followed, and Republicans denounce the frequent violence of France, nevertheless, given the ideas and the temper of the two parties, it was natural that the two bodies should move on diverging lines. The New England manufacturer or merchant could no more sympathize with France than the Western farmer or Southern planter could sympathize with England.

Personal slavery is despotism in a revolting form, and its prevalence in a democratic state might at first seem an impossibility. The fact is otherwise. Discussing the discontents in America in 1775, Mr. Burke said that "where multitudes of slaves are found those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom. Freedom is to them not merely an enjoyment but a kind of rank and privilege. . . . Such were all the ancient commonwealths; such were our Gothic ancestors; such in our days were the Poles; and such will be all masters of slaves who are not slaves

themselves. In such a people the haughtiness of domination combines with the spirit of freedom, fortifies it, and renders it invincible." We may add, and all the more where the slave owner and the slave belong to different and repellent races.

The fondness of the Southern slaveholders for States rights was perfectly natural ; the State governments they might fairly hope to control in the interests of slavery, but the National Government might become too large for them to manage. Then, their habit of personal domination caused them to look upon a vigorous central authority much as feudal barons looked upon the king. In Delaware and Maryland, and in South Carolina for a time, special forces overcame the natural tendencies of slave societies, causing them to adhere to the Federal party ; some of the slave States at a later day followed more or less constantly the fortunes of the Whig party ; but, all in all, the gravitation of the South toward the party that Mr. Jefferson founded is one of the most significant facts of our political history.

The divergent tendencies that appeared in our early politics, while sometimes modified or repressed, have never ceased to act. The relative density of population and the relative wealth of different districts, acting through industry and social life, have made themselves felt in the sphere of financial, economical, and political ideas. Until slavery became the overmastering political question, new States on their admission to the Union nearly all gravitated toward the Democratic party. Of the total amount of public debts repudiated by States and localities down to the present time, an overwhelming preponderance has been repudiated at the South and West. The explanation is easy. The hopefulness, ambition, and fiscal inexperience of new communities cause them to undertake enterprises beyond what their resources will justify ; while the pressure of heavy taxation, and the prevalence of loose ideas and traditions in respect to public obligations, together with disappointment at fail-

ure to realize expectations, lead them to hold lightly engagements which have been contracted. At the South since the War a large amount of public indebtedness has been disowned on account of its political parentage. Schemes to repudiate or impair the validity of the National debt contracted during the War, at one time so rife, had a much greater proportionate following at the West than at the East. Between 1837 and 1863 the country suffered enormous losses from incapable and dishonest banking. With few exceptions the good banking systems were found in the old States, the bad ones in the new States. Similar tendencies have shown themselves in connection with the National currency. Inflation and cheap money have proved very attractive to the younger, poorer, and less mature parts of the country.

We need not suppose that the greater fidelity of the old States to sound finance has been due to superior native virtue. It is rather a matter of interest and habit. These States own the greater share of the public indebtedness held in the country ; their banks and other financial institutions, as trust and insurance companies, are buttressed upon securities ; many private persons are holders of bonds, while the discipline that the people have received in the school of experience enables them the better to understand the conditions of prosperity, public and private. Communities where credits far outweigh debts are not likely to hold either public or private faith in small esteem, or to place a low valuation upon vested rights. At the East the Continental finance is remembered after the lapse of more than a century.

It is worth observing that the planting and farming districts have commonly looked with distrust upon the manufacturing and commercial districts, and particularly the cities. This distrust it was that in 1790 located the National capital in a forest on the Potomac, much to the disgust of the more cultivated classes at the North. The proposition to select a city, as New York or Philadelphia, was vigorously

opposed. Cities were held to be the home of extravagance and corruption, the country of frugality and honesty. Speeches that great statesmen then made upon this question breathe an idyllic faith in woods, streams, and farms that is very refreshing.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE SLAVE POWER.

References.—Greeley: The American Conflict, Vol. I., Chaps. I.-XXII.; Cairnes: The Slave Power; De Tocqueville: Democracy in America, Vol. I., Chap. XVIII.; Johnston: Political History of the United States, Lalor's Cyclopædia (Slavery in United States History, Territories, Annexations, Abolition and Abolitionists); Shaler: Nature and Man in America; Goldwin Smith: The United States; Wilson: History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America.

Beginning with the landing of the fourteen negroes at Jamestown in 1619, slavery gradually extended to all the English Colonies. At the close of the Revolution it had a legal existence in all the States except New Hampshire and Massachusetts. However, by far the larger number of slaves had always been at the South, as shown by the following table

	1715.	1775.	1790.
North.....	10,900	46,100	40,300
South.....	47,900	455,000	657,000

At the last of these dates slavery was on the decline at the North, and its final extinction there was soon anticipated. At the South, although slaves were multiplying rapidly in numbers, opposition to the institution was general, and few men of character could have been found to say that its in-

definite existence was either possible or desirable. Virginia opinion is well expressed in three quotations from as many prominent statesmen. Mason : "Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the immigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country." Jefferson : "Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice can not sleep forever." Washington : "I can only say that there is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it." Three months before the Declaration of Independence Congress adopted a resolution "that no more slaves should be imported into any of the thirteen colonies." At the same time the framers of the Constitution were compelled to reckon with slavery ; they left it where they found it, an exclusively State institution, but defined its relations to the Union in various compromises.

At the North the expectations of 1787 were fulfilled ; slavery continued to decline, and came to an easy death. At the South events took a wholly unexpected turn. In sixty years the slaves increased from 657,000 to 3,204,000 ; the slave States, from six to fifteen in number, extending not merely to the sources of the rivers flowing to the Atlantic, but to the Ohio, the Missouri, and the Rio Grande. Antislavery sentiment died out, or its utterance was stifled. Slavery took a firmer hold of State laws and institutions. In time business, politics, and religion were all adjusted to the new center. It was pronounced an industrial and social necessity and a divine institution. "Sir," said Mr. Dixon, of Kentucky, in 1854, "sir, upon the question of slavery I know no Whiggery and I know no Democracy ; I am a proslavery man." Nor was this all. The Slave Power controlled or modified National legislation affecting its interests, dictated the nomination and election of Presidents, and extorted from the Supreme Court a decision that reversed the policy that the Government had pursued on one important feature of the subject for nearly seventy years. More even than this—its

influence extended beyond the Ocean, reaching the marts and cabinets of the Old World.

In searching for the causes of the contrast between the course of things at the North and at the South, we must lay aside the idea that it was due primarily to moral differences. Morality played its part in both sections, but the causes that we seek lay in quite another quarter. In stating them I shall draw largely upon Professor Cairnes's admirable work, *The Slave Power*. "The true causes of the phenomenon will appear," he tells us, "if we reflect on the characteristic advantages and disadvantages which attach respectively to slavery and free labor as productive instruments in connection with the external conditions under which those forms of industry came into competition in North America."

The economic advantages of slavery are two in number: (1) The employer of slaves has absolute power over his workmen, and (2) he enjoys the disposal of the whole fruit of their labors. As a consequence slave labor admits of the most complete organization; it may be combined on an extensive scale and directed by a controlling mind to a single end, while its cost can never be more than the cost of maintaining the slave in health and strength. Its economical defects are three in number: (1) It is reluctant, (2) it is unskillful, (3) it is wanting in versatility. The slave works reluctantly, because he works for another and not for himself. Fear and not hope is his strongest stimulus. He is unskillful both because he has no personal interest in his work and so has no motive to improve, and because he is condemned to ignorance by his status as a slave. He lacks invention and adaptability for much the same reasons. He uses his muscles and not his brains. When a slave has been taught to do a certain thing he must be kept at that thing, and so he becomes the merest creature of routine and habit.*

* Dr. Carpenter remarks upon the power of habit in those persons who lack general culture and volitional control, their whole course of action being determined rather by what they have been "used to" than by what

Because he is reluctant, unskillful, and stupid, the slave must be constantly watched or superintended. Hence slave labor, to be profitable, must be capable of being brought within a narrow field of observation. It may pay to provide an overseer for a gang of men, but not for one or two, or even a few.

Both by its advantages and by its disadvantages slave labor, as a rule, was excluded from a large part of the field of production. It could not be employed advantageously where workmen were widely scattered or where work was on a small scale; it could not be employed where skill and versatility were required—ability to think, and so to deal with cases outside of the ordinary routine; the same must be said, and with even more emphasis, of employments requiring the use of machinery and tools save of a coarse and bungling sort. Even the animals used must be such as

even ordinary common sense would tell them was the best for them. He mentions a family reduced to absolute want who refused a supply of excellent soup thickened with barley merely because "they had not been used to barley." He says females of the humbler classes in England, having been accustomed to one pattern of prints refuse to accept departures from it, and mentions a case where the workman of an outfitter refused for two weeks to work because a slight alteration had been made in the pattern of a particular garment, although the new pattern imposed no more labor than the old.—*Mental Physiology, chap. viii.* Northern men who went into the business of planting at the South after the War sometimes furnished the negroes whom they employed with improved tools, but only to have them broken. President Lincoln did not emancipate the slaves from routine.

"I am here shown tools," says Mr. Olmsted, "that no man in his senses with us would allow a laborer to whom he was paying wages to be encumbered with, and the excessive weight and clumsiness of which, I would judge, would make work at least ten per cent greater than with those ordinarily used with us. And I am assured that, in the careless and clumsy way they must be used by the slaves, anything lighter or less rude could not be furnished them with good economy, and that such tools as we constantly give our laborers, and find our profit in giving them, would not last out a day in a Virginia cornfield—much lighter and more free from stones though it be than ours."—*The Seaboard Slave States, p. 46.*

could stand hard usage—mules, and not horses. Accordingly slave labor was mainly cut off from small and diversified farming, from all kinds of manufacturing, and from navigation. The slave is too dull to rise to the level of these employments. On the other hand, the advantages and disadvantages of slave labor confined it mainly to those occupations in which numbers of men could be directed by one head, in which the processes were of a coarse and routine character, and in which costly appliances were not necessary. Even to-day, while the common negro laborer can be profitably employed on a cotton or rice plantation in Georgia, he can not be so employed on a wheat farm in the Dakotas.

Such were the principal characteristics of slave labor as it formerly existed in the United States. It was confronted one hundred years ago by a system that Professor Cairnes, speaking in the language of his science, calls "peasant proprietorship," but that we may call farm ownership. Here all the former conditions are reversed. Both when the work is on a small scale and when the laborer works on his own account, no considerable organization of labor is possible. There is small room for classification and combination. "Occupation may be found for a whole family of slaves according to the capacity of each member in performing the different operations connected with certain branches of industry—say the culture of tobacco, in which the women and children may be employed in picking the worms off the plants, or gathering the leaves as they become ripe, while the men are engaged in the more laborious tasks; but a small proprietor, whose children are at school, and whose wife finds enough to occupy her in domestic duties, can command for all operations, however important or however insignificant, no other labor than his own, or that of his grown-up sons." The farm owner is his own director, and superintendency is abolished. He works freely since he works for himself; he tends to become skillful and versatile because necessity prompts and interest invites him to use his brains; and he takes care to inform and expand his mind

by acquiring a school education. Paid labor was often employed under this system, but the facts already stated determined its characteristic features. Free labor is indeed capable of extensive organization on public works or in manufacturing establishments, but this does not affect the argument.

The line that divided the free from the slave States also divided one system of agriculture from another. On the north side of this line the soil and climate were adapted to cereal crops and small farming; on the south side, to tobacco, cotton, rice, indigo, and sugar. Now, while slave labor was ill adapted, as the results proved, to the culture carried on at the North, it was admirably adapted to the culture carried on at the South. It met the necessities of planting but not of farming. No great skill was required to raise the Southern staples, while the conditions of organization and superintendence were fully met. Under the old *régime* one man could cultivate ten times as many acres of wheat or corn as of tobacco or cotton. On the other hand, while farm ownership was well adapted to cereal farming, it was ill adapted, at least in competition with the plantation system, to the production of the Southern staples. Farm ownership met the one set of conditions as slavery did the other. At the North the capitalist possessed no advantage as a farmer; at the South the free laborer was at a disadvantage. This reasoning is enforced by the fact that in those parts of the South where cereal crops were cultivated, as in portions of Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, and along the slopes of the Alleghany Mountains, the slave could not compete with the free man; but in the cotton and tobacco field, the rice swamp and sugar plantation, the free man could not compete with the slave. Using the names of the two staples as types, we may say that slavery died out in the North because the North raised corn, and lived on in the South because the South raised cotton. Still cotton was much more than a type, as we shall soon see.

But these facts alone do not explain why a century ago

slavery was thought to be doomed at the South, or why it soon after entered upon a period of extraordinary growth. Still other facts must be brought into view.

An intelligent observer wrote in 1773 that every colony had its peculiar commodity : Massachusetts, fish ; Connecticut, timber ; New York and Pennsylvania, wheat ; Virginia and Maryland, tobacco ; North Carolina, pitch and tar ; South Carolina, indigo ; Georgia, rice and silk. Neither one of the typical commodities is here mentioned. Slave labor was employed upon the characteristic productions of the South ; tobacco had indeed enriched the planters of Virginia and Maryland, but neither tobacco nor all the peculiar Southern productions together promised slavery a long life. The great industrial, political, and moral system that we call the Slave Power never could have been built up upon any economical basis existing at the South at that time.

The cotton plant was little known in the colonies save as a garden plant before the Revolution. Seven bags were exported from Charleston in 1748. In 1784 the custom officers at Liverpool seized eight bales on an American ship because, as they said, it was impossible that so large a quantity could have been produced in the United States. The exports for the next six years respectively were 14, 6, 104, 389, 842, and 81 bags. Chief-Justice Jay apparently did not know in 1794 that cotton was an article of export from his country. Although cotton fabrics had been introduced into Europe from Asia before the Christian era, they never became the object of large manufacture and sale previous to our own century. The forty thousand bales that the West Indies furnished England at the close of the last century are said to have been three-fourths of the total cotton supply at that time.

A mighty impulse was given to cotton culture in the United States, and through that culture to slavery, by a series of remarkable inventions made in the second half of the eighteenth century. In 1750 Kaye invented the fly

shuttle ; in 1770 Hargreaves, the spinning jenny ; in 1775 Crompton, the mule jenny ; in 1769-'75 Arkwright made the inventions that bear his name ; in 1783 Watts fitted the steam engine, which he had already improved, to carding and spinning ; and in 1785-'87 cylinder printing and the use of acids for bleaching were introduced. But these inventions did not solve the problem ; the series was not complete ; the inventor was needed on the plantation as well as in the factory. Cotton fabrics could not enter largely into the commerce of the world until they became cheap, and they could not become cheap so long as a day's labor of a slave was required to clean five or six pounds of cotton for market. So everything turned on a cheap and expeditious mode of separating the cotton seed from the fiber. In 1793 Eli Whitney, a Connecticut schoolmaster, invented the cotton gin, and thus completed the series of inventions connecting the plantations of the South with the markets of the world. With this engine a slave could clean a thousand pounds of cotton in a day. Immediately the growing of cotton began to show fresh signs of life, and soon to increase by leaps and bounds. The export was 89,000 pounds in 1791 ; 138,000 in 1792 ; 487,000 in 1793 ; 1,600,000 in 1794 ; 6,276,000 in 1795 ; 38,118,000 in 1804. "Within five years after Whitney's invention," it has been said, "cotton had displaced indigo as the great Southern staple, and the slave States had become the cotton field of the world." The world would take an indefinite amount of cotton goods if they could be furnished cheap ; the manufacturers of England would furnish them cheap if the staple could be had at a low price ; the Southern States—with their abundance of new lands well adapted to the culture, their system of slave labor, and Whitney's gin—would provide the staple at a low price. The circle of inventions was completed, and events were put in train for crowning cotton king, and for building up the Slave Power. The demand for cotton enhanced the value of slave labor and of cotton lands ; the enhanced value of slave labor and cotton lands stimulated slave breed-

ing and Western emigration, and these in turn led to the formation of new slave States.

Before Whitney made his invention population had begun to flow from the old States into the wilderness west of the Alleghanies, those from the South taking with them their slaves. Here the conditions of soil and climate that they found were similar to those that they had left behind them ; the line separating the conditions favorable to cereal crops from the conditions favorable to the Southern staples extended westward. In other words, the natural causes that were bringing slavery to an end in New England and in the Middle States and those that were about to give it a new lease of life in the South, declared themselves. The total results were the formation of a new South and the formation of a new North on opposite sides of the Ohio River.

Two subsidiary causes accelerated the westward extension of slavery, one industrial and one political. Cotton production as carried on proved very exhausting to the soil. In a few years even the best lands were worn out and had to be abandoned. Hence resulted a constant demand for new lands even to maintain the former production, leaving increased production out of sight, which could be found only in the West. Then the political status of slavery was always peculiar and even precarious. Against the institution were arrayed, in the long run, the forces of modern civilization. All over the civilized world slave labor had shown itself incapable of competing with free labor, save under unusual circumstances. For example, so far as we can see, the cotton gin alone saved slavery in the old Southern States from death. The maintenance of the unusual conditions essential to the continued existence of slavery—as need of virgin lands and immunity from interference—gave rise to those political necessities which in turn contributed to the consolidation of the Slave Power. Not only must the State governments be kept friendly, but the National Government must at least be kept from becoming hostile. This second end again could be accomplished only

by maintaining the largest possible representation in the two Houses of Congress, and by controlling the executive and the judiciary. And this involved, once more, the relative numbers of slave and free States, or what was sometimes called "the balance of the Constitution."

In 1787 there were seven Northern and six Southern States. In 1820 there were eleven of each ; the balance that many statesmen thought necessary to political equilibrium and the stability of the Union had been maintained for a full generation. Thus far the formation of new slave States had come about spontaneously, without reference to a political programme, as population had extended westward in obedience to general causes. Neither was the annexation of Louisiana or of Florida due to slave influence ; both of those accessions of territory flowed rather from general than from local causes. Still further, slavery, while a sectional interest, had not thus far directly influenced party politics. Hitherto it had not been objected to the admission of any State to the Union that it offered either a free or a slave constitution.

The State of Missouri balanced Maine, but its admission with slavery was secured by the South only by conceding the restriction which accompanied it, namely : "That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana which lies north of $36^{\circ} 30'$ north latitude, excepting only such part thereof as is included within the State contemplated by this act [that is, Missouri], slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crime whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be and hereby is forever prohibited." On the conclusion of this famous compromise this was the situation : At the South, territory for only two more slave States, Arkansas and Florida, remained ; while at the North the territory out of which Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and parts of other States have since been carved lay open to free labor. Confronted by this situation, the Slave Power thought it neces-

sary to secure new territory adapted to cotton culture that could be cut up into new States, unless, indeed, the old balance were to be abandoned. This belief, combined in the first two instances with other causes, led, first, to the admission of Texas with a proviso that it might be divided into five States; second, to the two Mexican annexations; and, third, to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise with a view of making slave States north of the line drawn in 1820.

While slavery wholly died out in the Northern States, still the North for a time paid little attention to the change that was going on at the South. Opposition to the spread of slavery in the Northwest was general; also a quiet acquiescence in its extension in the Southwest; but of active opposition to the institution as such there was very little. About the time that the change of front had been fully accomplished a new opposition began to declare itself. The New England Antislavery Society was organized in 1832, the American Antislavery Society in the year following, both on abolition lines. The opinions that slavery was a grave economical mistake, a serious political evil, and a great moral wrong began to take root in the Northern mind. More and more the conviction prevailed that free labor and slave labor were antagonistical, and that slavery was a standing menace to the peace of the country. Mr. Seward said that the conflict between the two was irrepressible, and Mr. Lincoln that the republic could not permanently endure half slave and half free. Practical opposition assumed different forms. The abolitionists called for immediate abolition; originally this was a moral and not a political movement. Political opposition, expressed in the Liberty party 1840-'48, in the Free-Soil party 1848-'54, and in the Republican party 1854 and years following, strove to restrict the further spread of slavery in any quarter, but did not directly oppose its continued existence at the South. Directed as it was against what Southern men freely called the corner stone of Southern society, opposi-

tion of any kind could not fail to awaken a bitter sectional controversy.

The contest that had now been joined between the two systems of labor turned more and more against the South. Texas, admitted in 1845, was the last of the slave States. Population that would justify the division of that State was not forthcoming, the Mexican annexations did not for the time enlarge the area of slave territory, and the attempt to carry slavery north of the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ met with failure. While slavery extended only to the Rio Grande, the admission of California and Oregon gave the Pacific slope to freedom, and furnished the strongest pledge that the new States yet to be formed in the West and Northwest would be free States also. Kansas was demanding admission with a free-state constitution, and other States would be ready in the near future. In 1860 there were eighteen free States to fifteen slave States. With all the rest, the Northern States surpassed the Southern in population and in wealth even more than in numbers.

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854 brought into the field a great political party distinctly pledged to oppose the very policy that was essential to the growth of the Slave Power, and in the end to its very existence. The National Republican platform of 1856 contained the declaration: "That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery." With slavery in the States and in the District of Columbia the party did not propose to interfere. The same year the Democrats laid down the rule of "non-interference of Congress with slavery in the States and Territories or the District of Columbia." In 1860 the Republicans stood upon the same ground as before; while the Democrats, unable to agree as to the meaning of non-interference, split into two factions, one declaring it the duty of the Supreme Court to

determine what power a Territorial legislature had over the subject of slavery, the other that the citizens of every State had an equal right to carry their property (slaves of course included) into any Territory without being disturbed by either Congressional or Territorial legislation. The election of Mr. Lincoln signified the future limitation of the institution within the bounds in which it then existed and the loss of its prestige in National politics; and the Slave Power, discerning this fact, seeing also that the old balance between slavery and freedom was at an end, and believing, or affecting to believe, that the next step would be interference with the institution in the States where it already existed, precipitated the secession of eleven States from the Union, and brought on the Civil War.

Throughout the long struggle that culminated in the War the better adapted any State or district was to slave cultivation, the more firmly was the institution intrenched and the more aggressive was its spirit. The border States, both because they adjoined the North and because the conditions of slave cultivation were less favorable than they were farther South, hesitated on the brink of secession. In Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri the Union sentiment was so strong that, re-enforced by Union troops, it kept those States from seceding, while Virginia went with the Southern Confederacy only when the resort to arms came, giving as her reason for seceding that States were sovereign, and that she could not sit idly by and see sister States coerced, and much less assist in their coercion. Nor is this all: numbers of men in most or all of the seceding States adhered to the Union. These were nearly all found in districts where slavery had a feeble hold of the industrial system, and accordingly where the conditions of slave cultivation were not well developed. The Virginians west of the mountains refused to follow the Old Dominion, and formed a new State loyal to the Union. Moreover, while the Unionists of the Appalachian Mountain system below the Virginia line may not have been in a majority, they

nevertheless furnished many regiments of excellent troops to the National cause. On the other hand, we never read of similar enlistments in tide-water Virginia or the "black belt" of South Carolina, save of negroes. Besides the attachment of the cereal farmer of the mountain regions to the Union, he had nothing in common with the plantation and plantation life, but rather felt for them an invincible repugnance. In fact, the tendency to division in Virginia, where perhaps the two conditions were more plainly marked than in any other State, antedated the war. Speaking of Kentucky at the opening of the struggle, Professor Shaler puts forward a view with which this branch of the subject may well be dismissed :

When in 1861 it was to be determined whether Kentucky should go with the South or North, the question turned in the main on the occupations of the population. Where the soils were rich the plantation system was possible, the slave element was large, and in general the voice of the people was for union with the South. Where the soils were thin the people had no interest in slavery, for they owned no negroes. Old frictions with the slave-holding portions of the State existed, and consequently the people of this sterile land were generally devoted to the Union. A soil map of Kentucky would in a rude way serve as a chart of the politics of the people in this crisis in the nation's history. If Kentucky possessed a soil altogether derived from limestone there is no question but that it would have cast in its lot with the South.

Only one or two further facts require to be mentioned. At the South, manufactures barely existed, while commerce and agriculture, as compared with the North, were greatly restricted. Slavery served to discredit all kinds of productive labor. The first result of these causes was that industry and trade were far less attractive than at the North, and men of character and standing were accordingly thrown back upon the professions or a life of leisure. To such a life also the climate somewhat invited. The second result was the enhanced attention paid to law and politics—to which also the political necessities of slavery invited—and

to military and other similar exercises. The political and military virtues were well developed. At the North, on the other hand, while law and politics were by no means neglected, society took on an industrial and commercial cast beyond anything elsewhere known. The genius of the people was pacific. Not only Southerners, but also foreigners, often reproached the people of the North for their devotion to money-making. If the military virtues were not despised, they were little cultivated. These factors affected the war in two ways : in its early stages, and to some extent throughout, the South enjoyed a certain advantage arising from its military qualities ; but in the end the superior population and material resources that freedom had fostered won the battle.

At the close a note that has already been sounded may again be struck. History is not an exact science. Physical causes alone do not control the life of man. Individualities, as Carlyle calls them—free wills—not to speak of hazard or accident, make definite prediction of the future impossible. The statesmen of the Revolution did not foresee the future course of slavery ; the statesmen of 1850 did not anticipate its final catastrophe. There is the more reason for repeating this note here because no chapter in our history more strongly tends to establish the doctrine of universal physical causation than the chapter relating to slavery. But even here the argument fails. It required a statute to put an end to the institution in all the old States, and in New York that statute did not come until 1817. One half each of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio was quite as well adapted to slave labor as one half of Missouri ; and it would undoubtedly have established itself in all those States had it not been for the ordinance of 1787. As it was, the prohibition was maintained with much difficulty. If Mr. Clay's emancipation plan had been adopted by Kentucky early in the century—not a violent thing to suppose—there is little reason to think that the action would have been afterward

reversed. Even at the last there was a considerable number of men at the South who did not accept the doctrines of their section, while at the North the champions or the apologists of the Slave Power were a multitude.

Again, the action of great political parties can not be positively predicted, even within the limits of their traditions and platforms. Responding to impulses imparted to them by their leaders, swerved by the pressure of particular situations, or overzealous for immediate advantage, they all tend more or less to play fast and loose with their principles. With the exception of that lull in political activity following the War of 1812, called the Era of Good Feeling, there has been a Strict-construction party and a Loose-construction party in the United States from the organization of the Government, the Democratic-Republicans and the Democrats forming the one line of succession, the Federalists, the Whigs, and the Republicans the other line.* But what inconsistencies do we not find on both sides! Following 1801 Mr. Jefferson and his opponents seemed to change places. The Slave Power, while adhering to States rights and developing within its bosom the dogma of secession, never scrupled to use the power of the National Government to promote its interests. And finally the Republicans, while emphasizing National principles in the strongest manner, have sometimes been found upon ground that more properly belonged to the Democrats.

Still we must not press such facts as the foregoing to the extent of denying the existence of general causes or of discrediting history as a guide in practical affairs. There is a moral order: similar causes produce similar effects. Trees

* "This question of a strict or a loose construction of the Constitution has always been at the root of legitimate national party differences in the United States. All other pretended distinctions have been either local and temporary or selfish and misleading, and the general acceptance of any such party difference would mark an unfortunate decline in the political intelligence of the people."—*Johnston: Political History of the United States, Introduction.*

bring forth fruit after their kind ; men do not gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles. The great source of difficulty is that moral problems are very likely to be complex and so confused. Man and Nature together make history ; and man's powers of prevision and of lordship, although limited, are the more important factors in the product.

CHAPTER XXIII.

TEACHING CIVICS.

References.—Of literature dealing with the academical side of the subject, there is an abundance. A few titles are given without distinguishing between general treatises and text-books. Story: Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States (fourth edition, edited by Cooley); Cooley: A Treatise on the Constitutional Limitations which rest upon the Legislative Power of the States of the American Union (sixth edition, edited by Angell); the General Principles of Constitutional Law in the United States of America; Bryce: The American Commonwealth; Andrews: A Manual of the Constitution of the United States; Desty: The Constitution of the United States, with Notes; Lalor: Cyclopædia of Political Science, etc.; Wilson: Congressional Government, The State, Elements of Historical and Practical Politics; Fiske: Civil Government in the United States considered with Some Reference to its Origins; Hitchcock: American State Constitutions, a Study of their Growth; Ford: The American Citizen's Manual; O'Neill: The American Electoral System; Macy: Our Government: How it Grew, what it does, and how it does it; Nordhoff: Politics for Young Americans; Mowry: Elements of Civil Government, Local, State, and National; Hinsdale: The American Government, State and National (the author has taken particular pains to discriminate the National and the State-sides of our dual system, and has given unusual space to the State governments); Jamison: The Constitutional Convention.

Of pedagogical literature relating to the subject, there is very little. Compayré: Lectures on Practical Pedagogy (Morals and Civic Instruction); Spencer: Education (I, What Knowledge is of most Worth?); Crehore: Education, vol. vii (1887), p. 264 (The Teaching of Civics in Schools), p. 456 (Foundation Principles of Government), p. 547 (A Primary Study in Government); Vose: id.,

vol. vii, pp. 531, 617 (Methods of Instruction in Civics); MacDonald: The Academy, vol. v (1890), p. 373 (Teaching Civics); Bryce: The Contemporary Review, July, 1893, p. 14 (The Teaching of Civic Duty; an admirable article, written from the English point of view, but of universal utility).

FOR a decade and more increasing attention has been paid in our schools to teaching the branch of study called Civics or Civil Government. The aim has been to teach certain facts and principles relating to government in general, and to our own Government in particular, in such a manner as to enlarge the intelligence of the pupils, and to inspire them with the spirit of civic duty and of patriotism. The tendency is a healthy one. Civics is closely affiliated with history; it is emphatically an historical study. On the one hand a knowledge of political science is necessary to the successful pursuit of history; on the other, history is the torch that illuminates political science. Indeed, the two studies are so closely related that they can be carried on together with hardly more expenditure of time and effort than either one alone—that is, if really valuable work is done. In the elementary and the high school the two subjects are commonly taught by the same teacher. These facts are a sufficient reason for closing this book with a chapter on Teaching Civics.

In previous chapters some remarks were made upon the value to historians of a practical knowledge of public affairs. Mr. John Morley has illustrated this thought by some extremely interesting examples.

It would perhaps not be too bold to lay down this proposition: that no good social history has ever been written by a man who has not either himself taken a more or less active part in public affairs, or else been an habitual intimate of persons who were taking such a part on a considerable scale. Everybody knows what Gibbon said about the advantage to the historian of the Roman Empire of having been a member of the English Parliament and a captain in the Hampshire grenadiers. Thucydides commanded an Athenian squadron, and Tacitus filled the offices of prætor and consul. Xenophon, Po-

lybius, and Sallust were all men of affairs and public adventure. Guicciardini was an ambassador, a ruler, and the counselor of rulers; and Machiavel was all these things and more. Voltaire was the keen-eyed friend of the greatest princes and statesmen of his time, and was more than once engaged in diplomatic transactions. Robertson was a powerful party chief in the Assembly of the Scotch Church. Grote and Macaulay were active members of Parliament, and Hallam and Milman were confidential members of circles where affairs of state were the staple of daily discussion among the men who were responsible for conducting them to successful issues. Guizot was a prime minister, Finlay was a farmer of the Greek revenue. The most learned of contemporary English historians a few years ago contested a county, and is habitually inspired in his researches into the past by his interest in the politics of the present. The German historians, whose gifts in reconstructing the past are so valuable and so singular, have for the most part been as actively interested in the public movements of to-day as in those of any century before or since the Christian era. Niebuhr held more than one political post of dignity and importance; and of historical writers in our time, one has sat in several Prussian parliaments; another, once the tutor of a Prussian prince, has lived in the atmosphere of high politics; while all the best of them have taken their share in the preparation of the political spirit and ideas that have restored Germany to all the fullness and exaltation of national life.*

These examples point directly to the first fact that should be borne in mind in respect to political education: it always begins with public affairs, and never with books or formal teaching. Some first-hand practical knowledge is as essential in civics as some first-hand natural knowledge is in geography. The examples point also, though less directly, to a second fact that is hardly less important: school study of the subject should begin with facts and not with definitions. The simple concrete elements of civil government are not unlike the similar elements of family and school government, and they are acquired quite as easily in their proper time. On the other hand, the fundamental terms of political science are

* Critical Miscellanies, second series, pp. 2, 3.

abstract, and the definitions of some of them are disputed. Accordingly, to give as first lessons definitions and discussions of nation, state, sovereignty, and the like would be the extreme of folly. Nor can anything better be said of the National and States rights theories of our own Government.

Some very simple lessons in civics may be given from the very beginning of school life; they should be brought in incidentally in connection with geography and history, should be oral in form, and should relate to matters proximate to the daily life of children; formal instruction upon the subject should not be deferred beyond the eighth year in school. By that time the boy, if really intelligent, by observation, by hearing conversation, and by reading the newspapers, has accumulated a store of political facts and ideas that will be of the greatest service to him. His facts are concrete facts, relating to local government, to State government, and to the National Government. He has also elaborated or received some political ideas and theories which will probably stand in need of future correction. Back of this knowledge is the somewhat similar life of the home and school, for the boy's first king is his father, his first queen his mother, and his first law and authority those that his father and mother have taught him. Taking the boy where he finds him, the teacher must seek to enlarge his range of facts, to clarify his ideas, to give system and body to his knowledge, and progressively lead him to comprehend the nature and functions of the government and of the state and his relations to them. Nowhere is it more important to remember that a child of fourteen is not a philosopher; nowhere more indispensable to avoid nice criticisms and abstract views; nowhere more important to keep in close and constant touch with reality. What shall the method be?

Before answering this question directly it will be well to state briefly the reasons why we teach civics at all. First, the discipline and the culture derived therefrom are the same that have been claimed for history in the first chapter of this work: the science demands observation and reflec-

tion in relation to a very important class of facts, the affairs of government, the activities of the state. But the great reason for teaching the subject in the elementary and high schools is its practical uses ; the pupil needs the information, the guidance, and the civic spirit that it affords. But that the study may accomplish these ends we must begin at home and not abroad. A second reason impels us to the same conclusion, viz., the pedagogical law relative to proceeding from the known to the unknown.

Our fundamental question is still left unanswered. Nowhere is there a greater distribution of political powers than in our own country, nowhere a greater variety of governments. We have National and State governments, county, city, and town governments, not to speak of still smaller jurisdictions. With which of these shall we begin, and how shall we proceed ? Shall we begin with the nation and proceed analytically ? Or shall we begin with the local elements and proceed synthetically ? With advanced pupils it is no doubt better to begin with the grand whole ; but with elementary scholars it is better to begin at home, at the center, as in the case of geography, and to work outward. This is both pedagogical and practical ; pedagogical, because the child's first political information and training relate to his environment ; practical, because his environment concerns him above all other matters. In strictest sense there is no room for choice ; we get our first social experience in the family and the school, and our first political experience in the meeting of the town council, in the court of the village magistrate, and on election day. Still, it must be said that when a boy is old enough to take up an elementary schoolbook on civics he has generally acquired much of this primary instruction and is also familiar with facts of broader scope.

Perhaps no government can be named that presents to the student, whether child or adult, greater difficulties than our own. This is owing to that very distribution of powers just mentioned. "The simplest governments are despotic

ones," Mr. Webster once said ; "the next simplest, limited monarchies ; but all republics, all governments of law, must impose numerous limitations and qualifications of authority, and give many positive and many qualified rights." But this is not all ; greater than the complexity that arises from our institutions as republican is the complexity that grows out of their double character. The course of history between 1607 and 1789 made our Government federal. Before independence it was the colony on the one part and the Crown and Parliament on the other ; since independence it is the State and the Union. What the Revolution did was, first to make the colonies free and independent States, and, second, to bind them together in one federal state. Our Government is not unitary, like England or France, but dual, composed of States that, in some respects, are independent and sovereign, and of a Union that within its own sphere is supreme and paramount. Every American citizen residing in a State is subject to two jurisdictions, or, as Professor Bryce has put it, he has two loyalties and two patriotisms. Our Constitution is peculiar. As a distinguished writer states the case : "The Constitution of the United States is a part of the Constitution of each State, whether referred to in it or not, and the Constitutions of all the States form a part of the Constitution of the United States. An aggregation of all these constitutional instruments would be precisely the same in principle as a single constitution, which, framed by the people of the Union, should define the powers of the General Government, and then by specific provisions erect the separate governments of the States, with all their existing attributions and limitations of power." No person can make anything of our political history or of our institutions who does not firmly seize these fundamental facts.

Which of the two sides of this system shall the elementary pupil first attack ? Evidently the State, using the term State in a sense that includes all local authorities. At this point a serious mistake has been made in the past. This

mistake is well illustrated by most of the text-books formerly used, and by many of those still used. Apparently the authors of these books have thought it necessary to exclude mainly the State or the Nation in the interest of simplicity, and then have thrown out the State as the less imposing of the two. Still President Garfield stated the exact truth when he said :

It will not be denied that the State government touches the citizen and his interests twenty times where the National Government touches him once. For the peace of our streets and the health of our cities; for the administration of justice in nearly all that relates to the security of person and property and the punishment of crime; for the education of our children and the care of unfortunate and dependent citizens; for the collection and assessments of much the larger portion of our direct taxes, and for the proper expenditure of the same; for all this, and much more, we depend upon the honesty and wisdom of our General Assembly [at Columbus, Ohio], and not upon the Congress at Washington.

Mr. Woodrow Wilson, comparing our system with that of England, says that the twelve greatest subjects that have occupied the public mind of the latter country in the present century are Catholic emancipation, parliamentary reform, the abolition of slavery, the amendment of the poor laws, the reform of municipal corporations, the repeal of the corn laws, the admission of the Jews to Parliament, the disestablishment of the Irish Church, the alteration of the Irish land laws, the establishment of national education, the introduction of the ballot, and the reform of the criminal law. All of these subjects, except the corn laws and the abolition of slavery, under our system would have been brought, so far as they could be dealt with at all, under the exclusive jurisdiction of the State.

The study of a government may be brought under two general heads : its organization and its powers ; its framework or mechanism, and what it may do. Under the first head our governments, State and National, conform to the same model. They both have three branches, legislative,

executive, and judicial. The legislatures are all bicameral, composed of two houses. The executive branches present hierarchies of officers, extending in the one line from the constable and policeman up to the Governor of the State, and in the other from the marshal and his deputy up to the President of the United States. The respective judiciaries are systems of courts reaching from the justice's or mayor's court up to the State Supreme Court or Court of Appeals, and from the commissioner's court up to the Supreme Court of the United States. The two governments as machines do not present to the pupil very great difficulties. Such difficulties as do arise are likely to grow out of the elections and appointments of officers. Here, however, he deals with matters of fact that are not very intricate unless he goes into too much detail. For example, the National Constitution provides that each House of Congress shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members (Art. I, sec. 5, clause 1), and a similar provision will be found in every State constitution. It would not be advisable, even in a high school, to describe minutely the methods by which Congress or a legislature exercises this power; it suffices to teach that every legislative house, like every other deliberative assembly, has such power.

The main sources of difficulty lie in the other field. The life and activities of an organism present more and more difficult problems than its skeleton or anatomy. Here it is, too, that we run at once upon the line separating National powers and functions from State powers and functions, along which hard questions are thickly strewn. It is scarcely necessary to remark that it is very desirable that every citizen should know wherein he is subject to the one jurisdiction and wherein to the other.

Here it will be found helpful to remember that the States, as political societies, are older than the Union, and that the National Government is a government of delegated powers. Article X of Amendments to the Constitution expressly declares that the powers which are not delegated to the Nation

or are not prohibited to the States are reserved to the States or to the people, which means that the State or the people may exercise such powers if they see fit. In dealing with this question, the convention that framed the Constitution inquired what powers were really national, and so necessary to the common defense and common welfare, and what were not ; the first they undertook to delegate to the National Government, leaving all others to the States, save where they saw reason for prohibiting their exercise. But it will by no means suffice merely to state this general rule ; the instructor must descend to particulars, or rather begin with particulars and end with the rule.

The National Government is a government of laws, and the teacher can not do better than to ask on what subjects Congress can legislate. The general answer to this question is found in Art. I, sec. 8, of the Constitution. It is very true that Congress exercises some powers that are not here enumerated ; at the same time it may be said that the springs of National power must be sought in this section. Were it cut out of the document, our whole political system as it now exists would tumble into ruins. Too much pains can hardly be taken to make the nature and the extent of these legislative powers clear to the pupil. This is far more important than to discuss many questions about the framework of the Government or the jurisdiction of the courts. The section referred to is here quoted *in extenso* ; following it, two or three provisions will be considered in detail.

SECTION 8.—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States.

To establish post offices and post roads.

To promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

To raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

To provide and maintain a navy.

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Revenue is the motive force of government. In England the throne is the fountain of honor, but the treasury is the seat of power. Revenue means taxes, and taxes, since they

touch everybody sooner or later, are of universal interest. So central is the subject of revenue and expenditure, that a distinguished statesman already quoted was accustomed to say that the person who could track every dollar in the Treasury to its source, and then follow it to its destination, would be a master of our whole system. We may here bring together all the provisions of the Constitution in respect to National taxation.

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises," etc. (Art. I, sec. 8, clause 1).

"Representative and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers" (Art. I, sec. 2, clause 3).

"No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid unless in proportion to the census or enumeration" (Art. I, sec. 9, clause 4).

"No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State" (Art. I, sec. 9, clause 5).

To explain these provisions the teacher must be able to think clearly, and must have at hand a store of facts for illustrating the points that will arise. Tax is a general term, meaning a regular pecuniary charge that a government makes upon the people for its own support. It includes duties, imposts, and excises. The Constitution recognizes two kinds of taxes.

First, direct taxes, which, as defined by the Supreme Court, consist exclusively of capitation or poll taxes, and taxes laid upon land, both of which must be divided among the States according to their representative population. While the power of Congress to levy such taxes is unlimited, save in respect to population, they cut a small figure in our fiscal history, having been levied for but five different years: 1798, 1813, 1815, 1816, 1861. The several acts have declared the amount to be raised, ranging from \$2,000,000 in 1798 to \$20,000,000 in 1861; have apportioned these amounts among the States according to the prescribed rule; have defined the

property on which the amounts so apportioned should be assessed, and provided for assessors to levy and for collectors to collect the tax. The early acts put the taxes on slaves and land; the act of 1861 on land alone.

Second, the Constitution seems to regard all other taxes as indirect, but does not so call them. They are styled duties, imposts, and excises. It is impossible closely to distinguish these terms. Duties are customs levied on imported goods; imposts are sometimes duties or customs, but commonly the word is used in a broader sense as synonymous with tax; excises are internal taxes, such as the present taxes on whisky, malt liquors, and tobacco. The word *excise* does not occur in our laws, *internal taxes* and *internal revenue* having taken its place. To distinguish between direct and indirect taxes has given rise to some litigation. The Supreme Court has decided that taxes on carriages, on incomes, and on bank-note circulation are not direct taxes but excises.

Such is the compass of the National taxing power. All the taxes that Congress has levied since the direct tax of 1861 are divisible into two classes: customs and internal taxes. The first are collected by customs officers called collectors of the port, the second by collectors of internal revenue. The first are all paid in the first instance by importers of dutiable goods, the second at the present time by the manufacturers of whisky, malt liquors, and tobacco. To avoid confusion, the teacher must point out that this use of direct and indirect tax differs from the use of the political economists. The economists call a tax direct when it is really paid by the person on whom it is assessed, as the owner of a farm; indirect, when it is added to the price of goods and is passed along by the importer or manufacturer to the retailer for the consumer to pay.

A few words in relation to the State will suffice. Only two provisions relating to the subject of taxation are found in the National Constitution.

“No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay

any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws " (Art. I, sec. 10, clause 2).

"No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage " (Art. 1, sec. 10, clause 3).

These are the only restrictions that the Nation has laid upon the State's taxing powers ; and outside of them the State regulates the matter for itself in its constitution and laws. As a consequence, the taxing powers of Congress and of the State legislature to a great extent coincide or overlap. The State may tax whisky, beer, and tobacco, for example, if it pleases ; but there has been a strong tendency on the part of both jurisdictions to avoid double taxation as far as possible, lest property and industry be unduly burdened. The teacher will not find it superfluous to point out when and where and by whom State taxes are collected, at least in the State where his pupils reside ; for persons who consider themselves intelligent can be found in every community who suppose that the taxes paid to the town or county treasurer or tax collector go in whole or in part to support the Government at Washington.

Particular attention should be drawn to the powers with which the two governments are clothed, enabling them to execute their respective functions. Those of the Nation are of the amplest sort. At no point is it dependent upon the State, in which respect it differs wholly from the Continental Congress and the Congress under the Articles of Confederation. If its operations are interfered with in any manner it acts through both its executive and its judicial branch. What is more, it has at its command, or can create, all the physical force that is required to meet any emergency that may arise. Witness clauses 10-16, Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, quoted above. If the civil officers are unable to enforce the laws, the President, as commander in chief, can employ the army and navy, and even the State militias, for that purpose (Art. II, sec. 2, clause 1). The President is sworn to execute his office, and to the best of

his ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States (Art. II, sec. 1, clause 8). What the President can do in this direction, acting under the Constitution and laws, President Lincoln showed in the Civil War.

The State also is fully armed with power to do its part of the work of government. It acts through its executive and judicial departments, and if its civil officers prove incompetent to execute the laws, the Governor, as commander in chief, must call out the State militia. Nor is this all: the State may invoke the power of the Union, if necessary. Here it should be observed that the State is shorn of many powers that belong to a nation. For example, we read in the Constitution: "No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay" (Art. I, sec. 10, clause 3). The reasons for these prohibitions lie upon the surface. If the States could maintain armies and navies at all times, could enter into treaties and compacts with one another and with foreign nations, and engage in war at their own discretion, the Union would speedily fall to pieces. It was necessary to prohibit these powers to the State, and to delegate them to the United States for the sake of the common defense and of the general welfare. But to compensate the State for the denial of the power of peace and war, certain obligations were laid upon the United States. "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature can not be convened), against domestic violence" (Art. IV, sec. 4).

The suppression of domestic violence and the maintenance of domestic order falls to the duty of the State; but if for any reason the State is unable to perform this duty, the United States are pledged to come to its rescue. In such a

case the Legislature, or the Governor, as the case may be, calls upon the President for assistance, and it then becomes the President's duty, provided he deems the emergency sufficient, to employ the army and navy, and even the State militias, to protect the menaced member of the Union. In the case of foreign invasion, the President need not wait on the action of the State authority, for such an invasion of a State is an invasion of the Union itself.

In one case the Nation may deal with domestic violence directly. If such violence is directed against itself, or if it interferes with the operations of the National Government, then the President can interpose at once, so far as its own protection renders this necessary. The criterion in such cases is not the character of the acts performed or the persons who perform them, but the authority that is interfered with. Reference to a single branch of the National service will make this plain.

Acting under the power to establish post offices and post roads, Congress has created the vast postal system that covers the whole Union. It is that branch of the Government which comes into practical relation with the largest number of people. More than this, its operations are so familiar that in teaching civics it furnishes the best possible approach to the National jurisdiction. This service is under the protection of the United States throughout all its operations. From the moment that a letter is deposited in a Government mail box on the street until it is delivered it is in the custody of the United States. An assault upon the letter carrier going his rounds, or upon the postmaster in the discharge of his duty, is an attack upon the General Government; but before the letter is deposited, or after it is delivered, the General Government is in no way responsible for it. To abstract letters from the postal mail box is an infraction of the National law; to abstract letters from a citizen's own private box nailed up beside his door is an infraction of State law. Again, the National authority is in duty bound to protect by armed force, if necessary, a mail train in its

passage across the country; but it is not in duty bound to protect a passenger train that runs a mile ahead or a mile behind unless it has been duly called upon to do so. Still, if a railroad has been placed in the hands of a receiver by a United States court, the United States must protect the road. Still another case may be supposed. A village post office is kept in a store. Two men break into this store at the same time; one removes letters and money from the post office, the other removes bags of coffee and money from the store; both have robbed the same man, and yet one has robbed the postmaster and the other the merchant, the one committed a National offense and the other a State offense. Verily, it is not strange that foreigners should find it difficult to understand our Government, and that many of our own countrymen shall be confused.

Undoubtedly the most difficult branch of our government both to understand and to teach is the judiciary. But it is not its organization that causes the trouble so much as its powers and functions. The operations of courts of law come under the common observation, particularly of children, much less than the operations of the political branches, the executive and the legislative. Moreover, these operations are often intricate and confusing, springing out of technical rules that few besides lawyers understand. Here is the source of much of the law's delay. Now pupils in schools are not, and can not be made, lawyers, and it is mere waste of effort to multiply details in teaching this branch of our subject. An outline somewhat like the following may be presented:

I. Both the Nation and the States have their systems of courts created by their constitutions and laws. The courts of different States differ in many minor points of organization and function and in name. Generally speaking, a State system is uniform throughout the State, as the Federal courts are throughout the Union. It is desirable that the pupil be taught the names and organization of the National courts, and of the courts of his own State.

II. The business of a court is to decide cases, or what are popularly called lawsuits, that grow out of the legal relations of men in society. To do this it must define or declare the law, and apply it to the pending case. Moreover, since our governments are based upon written constitutions that define their powers, cases arise involving the conformity of laws to the constitutions. Such are called constitutional cases, and the courts of final resort, or the higher courts, are authorized to pass upon the laws authoritatively, declaring whether they are or are not constitutional. When a law is pronounced unconstitutional it is null, void, and no law.

III. By the jurisdiction of a court is meant its power to try and pass upon cases and to administer remedies. The meaning of original, appellate, concurrent, and final jurisdiction should be clearly taught. Again, a general account should be given of the jurisdiction of the several courts, or at least of those that are in closest contact with the people. As the larger part of the judicial business done in any State is done by the State courts, these courts should receive the greater attention. For a boy to know what is done in the court of the village magistrate or of the county in which he lives is more important than the same knowledge relating to the Supreme Court at Washington.

IV. In the main the jurisdiction of the State courts is separate from and independent of the National courts, and *vice versa*, but there are some exceptions. The following are the principal ones :

1. The judicial power of the United States extends to controversies between citizens of different States, and between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States (Constitution, Art. III, sec. 2, clause 1). At the same time the State courts are open to such cases. Hence a citizen of New York or Ohio may bring an action to collect a debt against a citizen of Michigan or Indiana at his option, either in a National court or a Michigan court of competent jurisdiction, and either may try the case.

2. The judicial power of the United States extends to all

cases that affect or involve the Constitution, the laws, and the treaties of the United States (Constitution, Art. III, sec. 2, clause 1). Hence, any case of this character that arises in a State court may be removed from such court to a National court by taking certain steps prescribed by law. Such a case is said to involve a *Federal question*—that is, the authority of the United States. Acting under this power, the National courts have often declared State laws in conflict with the National Constitution. But this is the limit of their right to pass upon State laws. Whether the laws of a State are in agreement with the State's own constitution is a question for its courts to decide. It may be further observed that State judges themselves, as well as State Senators and Representatives, and all executive and judicial officers, are bound by the National Constitution, laws, and treaties, anything in the constitution and laws of their own State to the contrary notwithstanding (Constitution, Art. VI, sec. 1, clause 2). The meaning of this is that State judges must set aside State laws if they find them in conflict with the National authority.

3. Save in a few instances the Constitution does not exclude the State courts from the field covered by the National judicial power. The subject was left to the discretion of Congress. Congress has given the National courts exclusive jurisdiction in certain classes of cases, such as in patent rights and admiralty, but within certain limits it grants to State courts a civil jurisdiction concurrent with that of the National courts. This is a permitted and not a vested jurisdiction, for the Supreme Court has decided that Congress can not vest any portion of the judicial power of the United States except in courts ordained and established by itself. In a large range of legal business, therefore, the citizen may appeal to the State or the National courts for relief, as he may see fit, the ultimate authority of course residing in the latter. Some offenses against National laws may be prosecuted in State courts, as offenses against postal laws.

How far the teacher should enter into these particulars, if at all, must depend upon the age and fitness of his pupils. The same may be said of many other phases of the general subject. In no study are clear and correct ideas more important; in none are confused and false ideas more harmful. It is often painful to listen to recitations in civics, even in high schools, so hazy is the thinking and so inaccurate are the facts. The criterion by which to determine what should be attempted is what can be really done. It is very desirable, or rather necessary, to keep on the safe side. Such topics as attainder and corruption of blood should be left until the pupil grows up to them.

It has been said above that lessons in civics should begin with facts and not with definitions. However, the pupil should not be finally left without definitions. Professor Bryce observes that we should not be prevented by fear of the abstract "from trying to make the pupil understand the meaning of such terms as the nation, the state, and the law." "You need not trouble yourselves," he goes on to say, "to find unimpeachable, logical definitions of these terms; that is a task which still employs the learned. What is wanted is that he should grasp the idea, first, of a community—a community inhabiting a country, united by various ties, organized for mutual protection, mutual help, and the attainment of certain common ends; next, of the law, as that which regulates and keeps order in this community; next, of public officers, great and small, as those whom the law sets over us and whose business it is to make us obey the law, while they also obey it themselves." A pupil properly taught will not leave the elementary school until these fundamental ideas are firmly rooted in his mind.

It has been said, too, that instruction in civics should begin at home, and sufficient reasons have been given for so saying. But before the pupil has left the high school behind he should have paid some attention to the comparative study of political institutions. Points of agreement and of contrast between our own Government and the gov-

ernments of other countries, as France, Germany, and England, should be taught, care being taken to have it understood that the first of these countries is a republic, the second a federal empire, and the third a so-called limited monarchy. Not only would the information thus obtained be valuable, but, what is even more important, the faculty and habit of comparing political institutions would be stimulated. Nor should comparative study be limited to governments that now exist; it should also extend into the past, at least to the extent of the cardinal political features of Greece and Rome in the cases of those pupils who study ancient history. The work in civics should always be kept in touch with history and geography. Nor is it necessary to postpone a kind of comparative study to the high school; for example, many facts relating to the Government of England can be taught, and should be taught, in connection with our own early history. It is difficult to exaggerate the value of large knowledge of the present to the student who is exploring the past.

Along with the study of the Government should go the study of the political organizations and the political machinery by which it is carried on. The great features of the party system that has grown up in the country, with its committees, caucuses, and conventions, are of more practical importance than many features of the Government itself. The election of a President and Vice-President involves these steps: (1) The nomination of candidates by the National Conventions; (2) the nomination of State electoral tickets by State and district conventions; (3) the appointment, by popular election on Tuesday following the first Monday in November, of the electors; (4) the meeting of these electors at their respective State capitols, the casting of their ballots, and the dispatch of the lists to Washington; (5) the opening and counting of the returns at Washington in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives on the second Wednesday in February, and the declaration of the result. Here are five steps, the first two of which lie wholly outside


the law in the field of voluntary political agency. Our party system has made the third of these steps the real presidential election, whereas the people in 1789 intended that the fourth one should be such election.

Perhaps it will not be superfluous to remark that this chapter is not an attempt to describe the whole compass of teaching political science in its substance and methods. It is only an attempt to emphasize the value of the study; to relate it with history, to state where, as determined by the author's own experience as a teacher, the main points of difficulty arise in teaching the Government of the United States, and to suggest methods for overcoming these difficulties.

The leading points that have been made may be summarized. Instruction in civics, while it has disciplinary power, should look mainly to practical or guidance ends; it should begin with concrete facts and not with general definitions; it should first deal with the political facts forming the child's own environment and gradually work outward; it should therefore at first concern itself more with the State element than with the National element of our dual system; the distinction between the framework of government and its powers must be emphasized, due effort being made to overcome the difficulties that the second phase of the subject presents; great pains should be taken, by means of striking and apt illustrations, to make plain the line separating the State authority from the National authority, and the important part played by political parties must be recognized.

The highest ends of the study will be defeated in great part provided the instruction consists of mere enumeration of facts or definition of abstractions. Nor is it sufficient to organize the facts and make the definitions real. The study should look to patriotism and the civic spirit—that is, to love of country and disposition to insist upon the rights and perform the duties that spring out of the citizen's relations

to civil society and the state. The ends of human government are these rights and duties. Dr. Lieber, the distinguished publicist, was accustomed to say, "No right without its correlative duty, no duty without its correlative right." The highest aims of civics, as a branch of education, are the instruction of youth in these ends, and the formation of characters that will maintain the one and perform the other.



INDEX.

- Adams, Mr., classifies scheme of internal improvements undertaken by Congress, 284.
- Administrations, presidential, usefulness of, in classifying historical matter, 84.
- Agricultural productions, influence of, on history, 33.
- Aix-la-Chapelle, treaty of, 223.
- Alaska, history of, as a territory, 273; name of, proposed by Mr. Sumner, 274.
- Alleghanies, the first road through the, 279.
- Alliance of France with the American colonies, 240.
- America, how it was named, 178.
- American ideas in New England, 231.
- Americus Vesputius and the New World, 177.
- Analysis of matter in text-book, advantage of, 65.
- Anaxagoras on the organization of facts, 69.
- Anecdotes, use of, in history, 48.
- Anglia, the ancient name of England, 165.
- Antillia, or the Isle of Seven Cities, an imaginary island, 179.
- Antiquities as a source of information, 35; knowledge of, indispensable to the teacher, 145.
- Appalachian Mountains, highest summits of, 195.
- Apparatus, historical, 84.
- Apperception, 11.
- Aragon, permanent union of, with Castile, 163.
- Archæology as a source of information, 35.
- Area of the United States, with dates of acquisition, 276.
- Aristotle on the contrast between the repose of Asia and the energy of Europe, 128.
- Arnold, Dr., on the duty of study, 17; defines history, 18.
- Arnold, Matthew, on culture, 18.
- Asia as used in history, 154.
- Asia Minor, first appearance of the name, 155.
- Association, the laws of, 69.
- Assyria, civilization of, 25; archæological researches in, 35.
- Astoria, Ore., founding of, 271, 272.
- Atlantic slope, average width of, 196.
- Attila, destruction of towns by, 123.
- Aulus Gellius on the humanities, 13.
- Austria, a confusing name in history, 161.
- Baccalaos, origin of the name, 180.
- Bacon, Sir Francis, on time, the greatest innovator, 107; on the true office of history, 108.
- Bain's *The Art of Study*, quotations from, 61; three fundamental propositions laid down in, 63.
- Baltimore, the battle of, 251.
- Bancroft on the issue of 1754, 230.
- Barbarians, renown of the wondrous deeds of, 18.
- Battle of Otterburn, ballad of, mentioned, 57.
- Bering discovers the Strait of Bering, 273.
- Berkeley, Bishop, on the prospect of planting arts and learning in America, 269.
- Berlin, elementary schools of, 58.
- Bermudas, a part of Virginia, 188.
- Bibliography, general, xvii.
- Biographies of monarchs, light thrown on society by, 49.

- Biography, bearing of, on teaching history, 30.
 Bladensburg, battle of, 251.
 Blockade of our water front by the English, the, 250.
 Bodin, on the historical influence of physical causes, 111.
 Bolingbroke quotes Dionysius, 6.
 Bon Homme Richard, the battle of, with the Serapis, 241.
 Boundaries of the United States, the first national, 255.
 Brandywine, battle of the, 239.
 Brazil, why it was so called, 179.
 Britain and England, the distinction between, 164.
 British, retreat of, from Philadelphia, 241; capture of Savannah by, 241; evacuation of New York, Savannah, and Charleston by, 244.
 Bryce, Professor, on the subject of environment, 114; on man in his relation to nature, 135; on Dr. Freeman's books, 142.
 Buckle and the naturalistic theory, 112; on the growth of civilization, 118.
 Buena Vista, General Taylor at, 96.
 Burgoyne, General, surrender of, 238.
 Burke, Edmund, eulogium of, on the maritime enterprise and prosperity of the States, 241; on the discontents of America in 1775, 293.
 Cairnes, Professor, on the slave power, 299.
 Caledonians, in northern Britain, the, 165.
 Calhoun, Mr., on domestic manufactures, 289.
 California, campaign in, 96; the most romantic of American names, 182; claimed by Spain, 270; by Russia, 270.
 Calvinistic theology of Scotland, to what attributed, 112.
 Canada, origin of name, 183.
 Canal, the first, connecting the West and tide water, 201; Delaware and Hudson, completed, 285; Erie, 285.
 Capet, Hugh, skill and policy of, in producing modern France, 163.
 Capital, national, locating the, 295.
 Carlyle, Thomas, quoted, 6, 24, 86, 108; on subjects for reading, 94.
 Carthaginians, and their continent, the, 155.
 Castile, permanent union of, with Aragon, 163.
 Cathedrals, mediæval, what they exemplify, 130.
 Cause and effect, or the causal relation, 73.
 Central Pacific Railroad, the, high elevation of, 194.
 Central plain of North America, extent of, 196.
 Champlain, the father of Canada, 99; the "Father of New France," 208.
 Charles I's war, 85.
 Charles V, the last monarch crowned Roman emperor, 160.
 Charleston, surrender of, 241; evacuation of, by the British, 244.
 Chart, value of, in teaching history, 78.
 Chester, origin of the name, 171.
 Chevy Chase, ballad of, mentioned, 57.
 Chicago, the site of, 126.
 China rich in history, 16.
 Christianity, upon what based, 103.
 Chronology, 75, 78, 79, 88.
 Cicero defines history, 5.
 Cincinnati, how it was named, 189.
 Cities, location of, controlled by "geographical selection," 120.
 City of Mexico, Scott's campaign against, 97.
 Civics, a historical study, 315; why taught, 317; how taught, 318; its practical uses, 318; its difficulties, 318; mistakes made in teaching, 319; fundamental ideas of, 332; the highest aims of, 335.
 Civil government, the teaching of, in our schools, 315.
 Civil War, factors affecting the, 311.
 Civilizations of Egypt and Assyria contrasted with those of Greece and Rome, 25.
 Claims, territorial, made by Congress at the Revolution, 253.
 Clay, Henry, and the contest of 1812, 247.
 Climate, the influence of, upon man, 116.
 Climates, the doctrine of, 112.
 Clinton, Sir Henry, succeeds Howe in command, 240; meets Washington in battle at Monmouth Court House, 240.

- Clio, the muse of history, 88.
 "Codfish land," 181.
 Cologne, origin of the name, 171.
 Colonial period, the, 83.
 Colonies, French, of America, 26;
 English, 26; the Thirteen, 189; the
 French and English contrasted,
 214; English, character of the
 people, 217; American, alliance
 of, with France, 240; American,
 George III consents to the inde-
 pendence of, 244; commodities of,
 303.
 Columbus, Christopher, expectations
 of, on sailing from Palos, 175;
 name of, in the New World, 178.
 Commerce, influence of, on history,
 33.
 Commodities of the several colonies,
 303.
 Communication, establishment of
 means of, between the several
 parts of the country, 278; lines of,
 to connect the Atlantic seaboard
 and the interior of the continent,
 280.
 Compayré, on the universities of the
 Middle Ages, 82.
 Constitutional period, the, 83.
 Continental army, the disbanding
 of, 244.
 Continents, distinctness and unity
 of, 154.
 Contradiction of terms involved by
 the treaty of 1803, 264.
 Cook, Captain, visits coast of Cali-
 fornia, 270.
 Cornwallis, Lord, at Wilmington,
 242; takes possession of York-
 town, 243; surrenders his army,
 244.
 Cosmographiæ Introductio, 178.
 Cotton gin, invention of, 304.
 Cotton plant, the, 303; culture of,
 great impulse given to, by remark-
 able inventions in latter part of
 eighteenth century, 303.
 Council for the Indies, the organiza-
 tion of, 175.
 Court, the business of, 330; jurisdic-
 tion of, 330.
 Courts, systems of, of nation and
 states, 329; state, jurisdiction of,
 330.
 Cylinder printing, introduction of,
 for cotton fabrics, 304.
 Dates, how shall they be taught?
 76; not the skeleton of history, 88.
 Declaration of Independence, what
 it expressed, 234.
 Deduction, 67.
 Delaware and Hudson Canal, com-
 pletion of, 285.
 Delhi, a natural center of commerce,
 121.
 Democratic party takes up the line
 of free trade, 290; reorganized by
 General Jackson, 290.
 Demosthenes and the plain of Mara-
 thon, 14.
 De Soto, search of, for gold, 49.
 D'Estaing, Count, arrival of, in 1778
 with French forces, 240.
 Detroit, evacuation of, by the Brit-
 ish, 250.
 Diodorus defines history, 5.
 Dionysius quoted by Bolingbroke, 6.
 Discovery and explorations of the
 French, 211.
 Discovery, the right of, becomes sole
 ground of title, 205.
 Discussions, critical, 39.
 Dissertations as sources of informa-
 tion, 32.
 Dixon, Mr., of Kentucky, on slavery,
 298.
 Documents, literary, as a source of
 information, 35.
 Drake, Sir Francis, 181, 270.
 Draper, Dr. J. W., and the natural-
 istic theory, 113; on the geography
 of Europe, 114.
 Drawing, an instrumental study, 2.
 "Dutch," a derivative term, 159.
 Dutch traders at New York, 49.
 Duties, protective, after War of 1812,
 288.
 Earth's surface, influences that are
 due to the configuration of, 114.
 Economics, correlation of history
 with, 46.
 Education, relation of, to all the
 powers of the mind, 15.
 Egypt, civilization of, 25; archaeo-
 logical researches in, 35.
 Egyptians, division of time by, 21.
 Electricity, the introduction of, 287.
 Ellis, Dr. George E., on the name
 "Indians," 176.
 Emigration, early Western, 201;
 New England, 279.

- England, and Britain, the distinction between, 164; name of, why it never took the place of Britain, 165; naval superiority of, 245; establishes a blockade along our ocean front, 250.
- English character, qualities of, 213.
- English colonies of America, 26.
- English on the Atlantic Plain, 212.
- Environment, its influence on history, 114; Professor Bryce on, 114; stress placed on, by historians, 125; acts upon man, 127; dependence of man upon, 135; relation of, to foreign invasion, 168.
- Epochs of historical subjects, 32.
- Era, the, 78.
- Erie Canal completed, 285.
- Essays as sources of information, 32.
- Ethnology as an aid to study, 36.
- Euripides on the climate of Greece, 116.
- Eutaw Springs, battle of, 242.
- Explorations, French, 211; of Lewis and Clarke, 272.
- "Fact lore," 4.
- Facts, objective, 4; the choice of, 42; organization of, 67; connection of, 68; historical, principles for organization of, 73.
- Farm owner, the, his own director, 301.
- Federal Convention, the, 45, 94.
- Federal party, the, 291; causes of downfall of, 292.
- Federalism, what States constituted the strength of, 292.
- Flanders, a highway of war, 168.
- Flint on the philosophy of history, 104.
- Florida, why it was so named, 184; ceded to England by Spain, 256; history of, as a Territory, 262; Spanish claims to, 260; sold in 1819 by the Pope, 265; annexed to Louisiana, 266.
- Fly shuttle, the invention of, 303.
- Forefather's Day, 85.
- Fox, Charles James, as an historian, 142.
- France, modern, the evolution of, 163; alliance of the American colonies with, 240.
- Francia, the division of, in the nineteenth century, 162.
- Franklin, Benjamin, a great character in history, 99.
- Freeman, Dr. E. A., and his works, xviii; quoted, 20; on historical names, 34; sense of reality pervading books of, 142; on failure of German writers to understand the ancient democracies, 143; on the distinction between geographical and political names, 155.
- Free trade, 288; the Democratic party takes up the line of, 290.
- French and Indian War, 86; 224.
- French, colonies of, in America, 20; in the Lake and St. Lawrence Basin, 208; the hostility of the Iroquois toward, 209; discovery and exploration of the, 211; missions, 211.
- Froissart distinguishes history from chronicle, 103.
- Frontenac, Fort, when built, 222.
- "Gadsden Purchase," the, 268.
- Ganges Valley, fertility of the, 121.
- Garfield, President, on state government, 320.
- Gates, General, the victor of Saratoga, 242.
- Gaul, use of the name, 158.
- Generalization, 73.
- Genius, individual, 130.
- Genius of the age, the, 129.
- Geography, historical, 35; physical, as an aid to study, 36; in its bearings on history, 153.
- Geological maps, 117.
- Geology as an aid to study, 36.
- George III consents to the independence of the American colonies, 244.
- German Confederation, the, 160.
- German Empire, the, 161.
- German Kingdom, the, 159.
- Germany, teaching history in, 54; the principal political phases of, 159; Carolingian, 159; of Cæsar and Tacitus, 159.
- Gettysburg as a field of battle, 93.
- Ghent, the Treaty of, 252.
- Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 8.
- Gladstone describes our territory, 276.
- Goodwin, Professor, on the study of Greece alone as a preparation for good work, 145.

- Government, study of, 320; state and national, 321; American compared with English, 320; national, its powers, 322; judiciary branch of, difficulties of teaching, 329.
- Græci and the Romans, 157.
- Gray's discovery of the Columbia River, 272.
- Great Lakes, the, 199.
- Greece and the effect of environment on historical development, 119; a curious and instructive name, 156.
- Green, John Richard, early life of, at Magdalen Grammar School, 146; first historical efforts, etc., 147; as a historian, 139; quoted, 23; on the Duke of Marlborough, 108.
- Greene, General, succeeds General Gates in command of the American forces, 242.
- Grimm's tales, 57.
- Guerrilla warfare, 115.
- Guizot on the value of history, 6; quoted, 73, 107.
- Gulf of Mexico, the, 198.
- Hamilton, Alexander, propositions of, concerning state debts, 293.
- Hamilton, Sir William, quoted on organization of facts, 68; quoted, 73.
- Harris, Dr. W. T., on the elementary school, 71.
- Harrison, General, occupies Malden, 250.
- Harrison, Governor, the famous letter written to, by Washington, 282.
- Hawthorne on the fortifications of the Potomac, 150.
- Hellas, the ancient name of Greece, 156.
- Hellenes, the ancient name of the Greeks, 156.
- Henderson quoted, 40.
- Herbart-Ziller school of pedagogists, 57.
- Herder, the founder of the philosophy of history, 104.
- Herodotus of Halicarnassus, researches of, 18, 19; quoted, 119; on the distinctness and unity of continents, 154.
- Hildreth, Mr., on the Republican and Democratic parties, 291.
- Historian, main function of the, 109.
- Historical geography, 153, 174.
- Historical sense, development of, 58.
- History, educational value of, 1; sources of information, 1; great guidance value of, 5; defined by Cicero, 5; practical value of, 6; trains the memory, 7; valuable discipline of the thinking faculties, 8; valuable discipline of the imagination, 8; object of teaching, 11; Muse of, 13; furnishes motive power, 14; field of, 18; two grand departments of, 18; the story of man, 18; military, 19; ecclesiastical, 19; constitutional, 19; text-books of, 28; bearing of biography on teaching, 30; treatises on, 32; regimental, 34; pictorial and poetical elements of, 44; philosophy of, 47; a moral knowledge, 47; romance in, 48; poetry in, 48; anecdote in, 48; stories in, 48; what the teaching of it involves, 70; logical element in, 73; dynamic, not static, 75; the time relation in, 75; an evolution, 82; cause and effect in, 101; the true office of, 108; physical causes that act in, 110; spiritual elements of, 112; human causes that act in, 127; not an exact science, 311.
- History of England from the Accession of James II referred to, 22.
- Holy Places, 94.
- Holy Roman Empire, importance of a thorough knowledge of the, 160.
- Howe, General, defeat of, at Brandywine, 239.
- Hudson River, discovery of, 48.
- Hull, invasion of Canada by, 249.
- Human causes that act in history, 127.
- Humanities, the, 13.
- Hungary, what it consists of, 161.
- Iceland, Professor Bryce on, 117.
- Idealism, 48.
- Ideas and sentiments, 133.
- Illustration, materials for, 151.
- Imagination, faculties of, 45.
- Improvements, internal, interest in, 283; scheme of, undertaken by Congress, 284; become a political question, 287.
- Independence of text-books, 65.

- Indian names, 186.
 Indians, how they came to be so called, 175; ignorance of the, concerning Nature, 102.
 Induction, 68.
 Industrial systems, 50.
 Inhabitants of mountainous regions and those of plains and valleys contrasted, 166.
 Inscriptions as a source of information, 35.
 Instruction, elementary, 48; in history, principles that should underlie it, 56.
 Iroquois, the, hostility of, toward the French, 209; the, in early American history, 227.
 Italy, extent of, in time of Julius Cæsar, 157; and the Romans, 157.
 Jackson, General, victory of, at New Orleans, 252; reorganizes the Democratic party, 290.
 James, Professor, on physiological retentiveness, 71.
 Jefferson, Thomas, on the site of New Orleans, 259; on slavery, 298.
 Jews, the patriotism of, 15.
 Jones, John Paul, voyage of, 241.
 Judiciary branch of our government, difficulties of teaching, 329.
 Kearney, General S. W., subjugation of New Mexico by, 97.
 King George's War, 86.
 King William's War, 85, 221.
 Klemm, Dr. L. R., on excellence of historical instruction in a school in Rhenish Prussia, 55.
 Knowledge, varieties of, 17; principal sources of, 27; organization of, 73.
 "Laboratory method," 39.
 Lafayette on the Revolution, 231; participates in the siege of Yorktown, 243.
 Lake Champlain, discovery of, 99; "Lake Champlain in History," 100; called "the Gate of the Country," 200.
 Lake Erie, victory of Perry on, 249.
 La Salle takes possession of Louisiana, 262.
 Lavissee on the influence of nature on history, 136.
 Law, constitutional correlation of history with, 46.
 Lecky on moral forces, 106; on the usefulness of history, 107; on military or industrial habits, 131; on men of genius, 132.
 Lectures, courses of, as a means of instruction, 61.
 Leuctra, influence of the name, 15.
 Lewis and Clarke, explorations of, 272.
 Lexington, battle of, 88, 232.
 Lieber, Dr., defines guerrilla, 115.
 Lincoln on the immortality of the name of Gettysburg, 14; stories told by, 48.
 Literature, general value of, to the teacher, 151.
 Livy's History of Rome, division of, into decades, 80.
 Locke on the value of history, 6.
 London, Mackinder on the greatness of, 123.
 "Lone Star" republic, 267.
 Louisiana purchase, the, 185; the territory of, 258; retroceded to France by Spain, 261; purchased by the United States, 262; La Salle takes possession of, 262; the first boundaries of, 263; the second, ceded to Spain by France, 264; and Florida, annexation of, 266.
 Lowell on New England history, 214.
 Macaulay on the value of history, 7; on the use of traveling, 13; quoted, 16; on detail in history, 20; quoted, 21; as an historian, 22; a master of historical narrative, 140; on Charles James Fox as a historian, 142; on Sir James Macintosh as an historian, 142.
 Mackinder, quoted, 115; on material civilization, 135.
 Macintosh, Sir James, as a historian, 142.
 Magdeburg centurists, the division of history by, 80.
 Manufactures, influence of, on history, 33; domestic, Mr. Calhoun on, 289.
 Maps, historical, 34; geological, 117.
 Marathon, influence of the name, 14, 15.

- Marlborough, Duke of, diplomacy of, 108.
- Marsh, George P., on physical causes that act in history, 113.
- Mason on slavery, 298.
- Materials, selection of, 42.
- Mathematical data, 67.
- Mathematicians' data, 10.
- McMaster, J. B., defines his plan of writing history, 23.
- Memoirs, personal value of, 30.
- Memory, faculties of, 45; operations of, 69.
- Mental qualities required to teach history, 141.
- Meteorology, the influences of, 116.
- Method, topical, 28; internal, 81.
- Mexican annexation, first, 267; second, 268.
- Mexican War, the, 95.
- Mexico, origin of the name, 183.
- Mexico, establishment of the republic of, 267.
- Middle Ages, the, 103.
- Milan, the ancient capital of Italy, 123, 157.
- Miller, Hugh, on geological history, 36.
- Milton on the educational value of history, 6.
- Mind, activities of the, 17.
- Missions, French, 211.
- Mississippi first called the river of the Holy Spirit, 186.
- Missouri Compromise, the, 306.
- Monarchs, biographies of, 49.
- Monographs as sources of information, 32.
- Monroe doctrine, 269, 272.
- Monterey, victory of General Taylor at, 96.
- Montesquieu writes *The Spirit of the Laws*, 103; and *The Spirit of Laws*, 112; on human causes that act in history, 129.
- Montreal, when founded, 209.
- Monuments as a source of information, 35; historical, scarcity of, in our country, 37.
- Morley, John, on the educational value of history, 7; some remarks of, to teachers of history, 143; on the value to historians of a practical knowledge of affairs, 315.
- Mosheim, 80.
- Mound builders, the works of, 37.
- Mountains, inhabitants of, and those of plains and valleys contrasted, 166.
- Music, notation of, 2.
- Names, geographical and political, difference between, 155; the meaning of, 157; geographical, the origin and meaning of, 163; local, records of the past, 169; origin and meaning of, 172; Indian, 186; and nationalities, relations existing between, 190; geographical, influence of religious creeds upon, 180; Old World, 191.
- National capital, locating the, 295.
- Naturalistic theory, 112.
- Navigation, inland, facilities of the United States for, 278.
- New England, named by Captain John Smith, 188; history, character of, 214; emigration, 279.
- New France founded by commercial companies, 215.
- New Mexico, subjugation of, by General Kearney, 97.
- New Orleans, victory of General Jackson at, 252; the site of, 259; acquisition of, 264.
- New York, superiority of, as a trade mart, 124; Dutch traders at, 49; evacuation of, by the British, 244.
- Nile Valley, fertility of the, 119.
- North America, form of, 193; western side of, 195; eastern side of, 195; central plain of, 196; great water ways of, 197; colonization of, 204; the struggle between France and England in, 219.
- Northern Pacific Railroad, elevation of, 194.
- Nullification, the question of, 289.
- Old Testament, the, 58.
- Old World names, 191.
- Olympiads, the, 21.
- Ontario, Lake, discovery of, 209.
- Oral teaching, advantages and disadvantages of, 59.
- Oregon, history of, as a Territory, 269; origin of the name, 270; boundaries of, fixed by treaties with Spain and Russia, 271; not a part of the Louisiana purchase, 272.
- Organization essential to real knowledge, 69.

- "Original materials," 36.
 Outlines, importance of, 63.
- Pacific Highlands, great elevation of, 193.
 Palestine, a highway of war, 168.
 Palo Alto, battle of, 96.
 Papacy and the empire, struggles between, 40.
 Paris, Treaty of, 244, 255; negotiations of the United States at, 253.
 Parkman on the ignorance of the Indians concerning Nature, 102.
 Parnassus in Greek history, 119.
 Partisan warfare rages in Georgia, 242.
 Party system, the practical advantage of, 333.
 Pascal, on the analogy of the race to the individual, 103; quoted, 108.
 Patriotism, 14, 15.
 Paul Revere's Ride, ballad of, mentioned, 57.
 Pedagogists, Herbart-Ziller school of, 57.
 Penn, William, treaty of, with the Indians, 99.
 Perception, the faculties of, 45.
 Period, the historical, 82.
 Perry, Commodore, on Lake Erie, 249.
 Personality an element of great interest, 44.
 Philadelphia, retreat of the British from, 241.
 Philosophy, political correlation of history with, 46.
 Pictures for an historical work, xxii.
 Pilgrim Fathers, 44, 49.
 Pilgrims, landing of, 85.
 Pitt, William, and the proposed conquest of Canada, 228.
 Pittsburg, the first inland manufacturing center, 279.
 Place, or the geographical relation, 73.
 Plataea, influence of the name, 15.
 Plutarch's Parallel Lives, 9.
 Plymouth Company, the, 188.
 Poetry in history, 48.
 Political parties in 1856, 308; action of, 312; inconsistencies of, 312.
 Political science, a knowledge of, necessary to pursuit of history, 315; powers, distribution of, in our own country, 318.
- Politics, a great educative power, 12; internal improvements become a question of, 287.
 Polybius and the conception of the universal, 102.
 Ponce de Leon, search of, for the fountain of youth, 49; and the discovery of Florida, 184.
 Postal system, the, 328.
 Potomac, the fortifications of, 150.
 Principles for organization of historical facts stated, 73.
 Printing cylinder, introduction of, for cotton fabrics, 304.
 Protective duties after the War of 1812, 288.
 Protection, the Whig party takes up the line of, 290; commerce the first great interest to oppose, 290; farming the last, 290.
 Prussia, the original, 162.
 Puritans and the shores of Massachusetts Bay, 93.
- Quebec, when founded, 208.
 Queen Anne's War, 86.
 Questions, special, strongly condemned, 64.
 Quiz, the, 65.
- Railroad, Northern Pacific, Union Pacific, Central Pacific, 194; first, connecting the West and tide water, 20.
 Ransome quoted, 51.
 Reading an art of acquirement, 2.
 Réclus referred to, 15 (note).
 References, 1, 18, 27, 35, 42, 53, 67, 75, 92, 101, 110, 127, 138, 153, 174, 192, 204, 219, 231, 245, 253, 277, 297, 314.
 Reformation, Protestant, 81.
 Religious creeds, influence of, on geographical names, 180.
 Republicanism, what states constituted the strength of, 292.
 Resaca de la Palma, battle of, 96.
 Revenue tariff, 288.
 Revolution, the, what it did, 319.
 Revolutionary period, the, 83.
 Rio Grande frontier, 96.
 River names, memorials of the earliest races, 171.
 Road, the first, through the Alleghenies, 279.
 Rocky Mountains, discovery of, 211.
 Rogers, Professor, on the influence

- of commerce, manufactures, etc., 33; on history of domestic politics, 33.
- Romance in history, 48.
- Roman Empire, the, a great political structure, 158.
- Romans, the original, 158.
- Rome, described by Livy, 121; founded by shepherds, 121; the site of, Professor Goldwin Smith on, 122.
- Roosevelt on the War of 1812, 248.
- Roumania; how it came to be so called, 158.
- Russia asserted a claim to California, 270.
- Russian America, the idea of the accession of, broached, 273; treaty of cession of, 273.
- Russian treaty of 1824, the, 272.
- San Francisco, 124; fine harbor of, 194; Bay of, 96.
- San Lorenzo, the treaty of, 261.
- Santa Fé, when founded, 207.
- Savages, the superstition of, 102.
- Savannah, capture of, by the British, 241; evacuation of, by the British, 244.
- Schaff, Dr., quoted, 5.
- Schools of Berlin, elementary, 58.
- Schurman, Dr. J. G., on organism, 104.
- Science, biological, 11; natural, as an aid to study, 36.
- Scotland, Calvinistic theology of, 112.
- Scott, General, campaign of, in Mexico, 97.
- Secession, causes which led to, 309.
- Seeley, Professor, on history, 7, 46.
- Seminar*, invention of, by the Germans, 65.
- Seminary, historical, 39; proper function of, 65.
- Sensation, bodily, 76.
- Sentiments and ideas, 133.
- Serapis, battle of the, with the Bon Homme Richard, 241.
- Seven Years' War, 8.
- Shaler, Professor, on the dependence of man upon environment, 135; on the contrast between the French and English colonies, 215; on the people of the English colonies, 217; on contest in North America between the French and English, 229.
- Slavery, introduction of, 297; at the close of the Revolution, 297; the economic advantages of, 299; economical defects of, 299; westward extension of, 305; political status of, 305; opinions concerning, 307; political opposition to, 307; conditions affecting its cultivation, 309; tends to discredit productive labor, 310.
- Smith, Captain John, story of, of interest to children, 49.
- Smith, Professor Goldwin, on the site of Rome, 122.
- Sociology, descriptive, 50.
- Socrates in the market place, 25.
- South Carolina nullifies laws previously supported by her, 289.
- Southwestern accession of territory, 96.
- Spain, a country of strongly marked character, 163; failure of, to plant her civilization in the West, 207; cedes Florida to England, 256; claimed the coast of California, 270.
- Spaniards, the, in early American history, 207; in the Gulf of Mexico, 206.
- Spanish Peninsula, the, 115.
- Spencer, Herbert, criticises history as taught in the schools of England, 20; quoted, 49; method of, 50, 70.
- Spinning jenny, invention of the, 304.
- Stars and Stripes, the, 14.
- State, powers and duties of the, 327.
- States rights, fondness of Southern slaveholders for, 294.
- St. Augustine, when founded, 207.
- Steam, utilizing the power of, 286.
- Steamboat, the first, to descend the Mississippi, 280; the first, to ascend Lake Erie, 280.
- Stony Point, storming of, 240.
- Story in history, 48.
- Stubbs, Bishop, quoted, 9, 13.
- Studies in general, uses and values of, 2; instrumental, 2; guidance or information, 2; disciplinary, 3; culture, 3; mathematical, 9.
- Succession, the relation of, 76.
- Sumner, Professor, on the growth of

- our national dominion, 266; on the act of 1828, 290.
- Systems, industrial, 50.
- Taine, M., on physical causes that act in history, 113.
- Tariff, revenue, 288; legislation, 288.
- Taxation, national, provisions of the Constitution in respect to, 324; powers of States relative to, 325.
- Taxes, kinds of, 324.
- Taylor, General, in the Mexican War, 96.
- Teacher, function of the, 17; main function of the, 109; qualifications of the, 138.
- Teachers of history, mental qualities required by, 141.
- Teaching, methods of, 53.
- Territorial growth of the United States, the, 253.
- Texas, annexation of, 96; history of, as a Territory, 267.
- Text-books, independence of, 65; of history, 28; analysis of matter in, 65.
- Thirteen Colonies, the, 189, 233.
- Thirty Years' War, 19.
- Ticonderoga, construction of, 228.
- Time, or the chronological relation, 7.
- Time relations, 89.
- Topical method of study, 60.
- Topics, value of, 64.
- Tordesillas, the treaty of, 205.
- Toryism, effect of Lancashire mines on, 118.
- Treaties made by the United States with other powers, 253.
- Treatises on history, 32.
- Treaty of Paris, 86, 244; of Ghent, 252; of San Lorenzo, 261; of 1803, 264, 266; of 1818, 271.
- Turgot quoted, 104.
- Union Jack, the, 14.
- Union Pacific Railroad, 194.
- United States of America, proposed name for, 189; comparative sizes of its physical divisions, 197; territorial expansion of, 202; treaties made by, with other powers, 253; negotiations of, at Paris, 253; ex-
- tent of, in 1783, 254; the original, 255; first national boundaries of, 255; title of, to territory west of the Rockies, 272; area of, with dates of acquisition, 276; industrial and political development, 277; facilities of, for inland navigation, 278; the judicial power of, 330.
- Upper California brought under American control, 96.
- Valley Forge, Washington at, 239.
- Venice, the beginning of, 123.
- Vespucian voyages, account of, written by Vespucius to Lorenzo de Medici, 177.
- Virginia, original territory of, 187.
- Von Moltke quoted, 134.
- War, Seven Years', 8; of Independence, 86; King William's, 85, 221; Queen Anne's, 222; King George's, 223; French and Indian, 224; of 1812, the, 245.
- Warfare, partisan, raging of, in Georgia, 242.
- Washington, George, mentioned, 45; efforts of, to defend New York, 235; crosses the Delaware, 236; at Valley Forge, 239; disbands the Continental army, 244; the famous letter of, to Governor Harrison, 282; on slavery, 298.
- Wayne, General Anthony, storms Stony Point, 240.
- Webster, Daniel, on government, 319.
- Weeden, W. B., on economy, 33.
- Wells, J., on teaching history, 15.
- Welsh, the origin of the name, 168.
- West, early population of the, 279.
- Whig party, the, takes up the line of protection, 290.
- Whitney, Eli, inventor of the cotton gin, 304.
- Writers, pedagogical, 2.
- Writing an instrument of impartation, 2.
- Yorktown, Cornwallis takes possession of, 243; siege of, 243; surrender of, 86, 244.



COLONIAL COURT-HOUSE,
PHILADELPHIA, 1707.


"This work marks an epoch in the history-writing of this country."—*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

THE HOUSEHOLD HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS PEOPLE.
FOR YOUNG AMERICANS. By EDWARD EGGLESTON. Richly illustrated with 350 Drawings, 75 Maps, etc. Square 8vo. Cloth, \$2.50.

FROM THE PREFACE.

The present work is meant, in the first instance, for the young—not alone for boys and girls, but for young men and women who have yet to make themselves familiar with the more important features of their country's history. By a book for the young is meant one in which the author studies to make his statements clear and explicit, in which curious and picturesque details are inserted, and in which the writer does not neglect such anecdotes as lend the charm of a human and personal interest to the broader facts of the nation's story. That history is often tiresome to the young is not so much the fault of history as of a false method of writing by which one contrives to relate events without sympathy or imagination, without narrative connection or animation. The attempt to master vague and general records of kiln-dried facts is certain to beget in the ordinary reader a repulsion from the study of history—one of the very most important of all studies for its widening influence on general culture.

"Fills a decided gap which has existed for the past twenty years in American historical literature. The work is admirably planned and executed, and will at once take its place as a standard record of the life, growth, and development of the nation. It is profusely and beautifully illustrated."—*Boston Transcript*.



INDIAN'S TRAP.

"The book in its new dress makes a much finer appearance than before, and will be welcomed by older readers as gladly as its predecessor was greeted by girls and boys. The lavish use the publishers have made of colored plates, woodcuts, and photographic reproductions, gives an unwonted piquancy to the printed page, catching the eye as surely as the text engages the mind."—*New York Critic*.



GENERAL PUTNAM.

"The author writes history as a story. It can never be less than that. The book will enlist the interest of young people, enlighten their understanding, and by the glow of its statements fix the great events of the country firmly in the mind."—*San Francisco Bulletin*.



JOHN BACH MCMASTER.

HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, from the Revolution to the Civil War. By JOHN BACH MCMASTER. To be completed in five volumes. Vols. I, II, and III now ready. 8vo, cloth, gilt top, \$2.50 each.

In the course of this narrative much is written of wars, conspiracies, and rebellions; of Presidents, of Congresses, of embassies, of treaties, of the ambition of political leaders, and of the rise of great parties in the nation. Yet the history of the people is the chief theme. At every stage of the splendid progress which separates the America of Washington and Adams from the America in which we live, it has been the author's purpose to describe the dress, the occupations, the amusements, the literary canons of the times; to note the changes of manners and morals; to trace the growth of that humane spirit which abolished punishment for debt, and reformed the discipline of prisons and of jails; to recount the manifold improvements which, in a thousand ways, have multiplied the conveniences of life and ministered to the happiness of our race; to describe the rise and progress of that long series of mechanical inventions and discoveries which is now the admiration of the world, and our just pride and boast; to tell how, under the benign influence of liberty and peace, there sprang up, in the course of a single century, a prosperity unparalleled in the annals of human affairs.

"The pledge given by Mr. McMaster, that 'the history of the people shall be the chief theme,' is punctiliously and satisfactorily fulfilled. He carries out his promise in a complete, vivid, and delightful way. We should add that the literary execution of the work is worthy of the indefatigable industry and unceasing vigilance with which the stores of historical material have been accumulated, weighed, and sifted. The cardinal qualities of style, lucidity, animation, and energy, are everywhere present. Seldom indeed has a book in which matter of substantial value has been so happily united to attractiveness of form been offered by an American author to his fellow-citizens."—*New York Sun*.

"To recount the marvelous progress of the American people, to describe their life, their literature, their occupations, their amusements, is Mr. McMaster's object. His theme is an important one, and we congratulate him on his success. It has rarely been our province to notice a book with so many excellences and so few defects."—*New York Herald*.

"Mr. McMaster at once shows his grasp of the various themes and his special capacity as a historian of the people. His aim is high, but he hits the mark."—*New York Journal of Commerce*.

". . . The author's pages abound, too, with illustrations of the best kind of historical work, that of unearthing hidden sources of information and employing them, not after the modern style of historical writing, in a mere report, but with the true artistic method, in a well-digested narrative. . . . If Mr. McMaster finishes his work in the spirit and with the thoroughness and skill with which it has begun, it will take its place among the classics of American literature."—*Christian Union*.

APPLETONS' CYCLOPÆDIA OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY. Complete in six volumes, royal 8vo, containing about 800 pages each. With sixty-one fine steel portraits and some two thousand smaller vignette portraits and views of birthplaces, residences, statues, etc.

APPLETONS' CYCLOPÆDIA OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY, edited by General JAMES GRANT WILSON, President of the New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, and Professor JOHN FISKE, formerly of Harvard University, assisted by over two hundred special contributors, contains a biographical sketch of every person eminent in American civil and military history, in law and politics, in divinity, in literature and art, in science and in invention. Its plan embraces all the countries of North and South America, and includes distinguished persons born abroad, but related to American history. As events are always connected with persons, it affords a complete compendium of American history in every branch of human achievement. An exhaustive topical and analytical Index enables the reader to follow the history of any subject with great readiness.

"It is the most complete work that exists on the subject. The tone and guiding spirit of the book are certainly very fair, and show a mind bent on a discriminate, just, and proper treatment of its subject."—*From the Hon. GEORGE BANCROFT.*

"The portraits are remarkably good. To any one interested in American history or literature, the Cyclopædia will be indispensable."—*From the Hon. JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.*

"The selection of names seems to be liberal and just. The portraits, so far as I can judge, are faithful, and the biographies trustworthy."—*From NOAH PORTER, D. D., LL. D., ex-President of Yale College.*

"A most valuable and interesting work."—*From the Hon. WM. E. GLADSTONE.*

"I have examined it with great interest and great gratification. It is a noble work, and does enviable credit to its editors and publishers."—*From the Hon. ROBERT C. WINTHROP.*

"I have carefully examined 'Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography,' and do not hesitate to commend it to favor. It is admirably adapted to use in the family and the schools, and is so cheap as to come within the reach of all classes of readers and students."—*From J. B. FORAKER, ex-Governor of Ohio.*

"This book of American biography has come to me with a most unusual charm. It sets before us the faces of great Americans, both men and women, and gives us a perspective view of their lives. Where so many noble and great have lived and wrought, one is encouraged to believe the soil from which they sprang, the air they breathed, and the sky over their heads, to be the best this world affords, and one says, 'Thank God, I also am an American!' We have many books of biography, but I have seen none so ample, so clear-cut, and breathing so strongly the best spirit of our native land. No young man or woman can fail to find among these ample pages some model worthy of imitation."—*From FRANCES E. WILLARD, President N. W. C. T. U.*

"I congratulate you on the beauty of the volume, and the thoroughness of the work."—*From Bishop PHILLIPS BROOKS.*

"Every day's use of this admirable work confirms me in regard to its comprehensiveness and accuracy."—*From CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.*

Price, per volume, cloth or buckram, \$5.00; sheep, \$6.00; half calf or half morocco, \$7.00. Sold only by subscription. Descriptive circular, with specimen pages, sent on application. Agents wanted for districts not yet assigned.

THE REAR-GUARD OF THE REVOLUTION.

By JAMES R. GILMORE (Edmund Kirke). With Portrait of John Sevier, and Map. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"The Rear-Guard of the Revolution" is a narrative of the adventures of the pioneers that first crossed the Alleghanies and settled in what is now Tennessee, under the leadership of two remarkable men, James Robertson and John Sevier. The title of the book is derived from the fact that a body of hardy volunteers, under the leadership of Sevier, crossed the mountains, and by their timely arrival secured the defeat of the British army at King's Mountain.

JOHN SEVIER AS A COMMONWEALTH-BUILDER. A Sequel to "The Rear-Guard of the Revolution." By JAMES R. GILMORE (Edmund Kirke). 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

John Sevier was among the pioneers who settled the region in Eastern Tennessee. He was the founder of the State of Franklin, which afterward became Tennessee, and was the first Governor of the State. His innumerable battles with the Indians, his remarkable exploits, his address and genius for leadership, render his career one of the most thrilling and interesting on record.

THE ADVANCE-GUARD OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION. By JAMES R. GILMORE (Edmund Kirke).

With Map, and Portrait of James Robertson. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

This work is in a measure a continuation of the thrilling story told by the author in his two preceding volumes, "The Rear-Guard of the Revolution" and "John Sevier as a Commonwealth-Builder." The three volumes together cover, says the author in his preface, "a neglected period of American history, and they disclose facts well worthy the attention of historians—namely, that these Western men turned the tide of the American Revolution, and subsequently saved the newly-formed Union from disruption, and thereby made possible our present great republic."

THE TWO SPIES: Nathan Hale and John André.

By BENSON J. LOSSING, LL. D. Illustrated with Pen-and-Ink Sketches. Containing also Anna Seward's "Monody on Major André." Square 8vo. Cloth, gilt top, \$2.00.

Illustrated by nearly thirty engravings of portraits, buildings, sketches by André, etc. Contains also the full text and original notes of the famous "Monody on Major André," written by his friend Anna Seward, with a portrait and biographical sketch of Miss Seward, and letters to her by Major André.

FROM FLAG TO FLAG. *A Woman's Adventures and Experiences in the South during the War, in Mexico, and in Cuba.* By ELIZA MCHATTON-RIPLEY. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00.

The author of this book was the wife of a planter in Louisiana, and underwent some remarkable experiences in the first part of the war; later in Mexico, many vicissitudes befell her; and of her life in Cuba, still later, she has a striking and unusual story to tell.

"In a word, the book is an account of personal adventures which would be called extraordinary did not one remember that the civil war must have brought similar ones to many. Her hardships are endured with the rarest pluck and good humor, and her shifty way of meeting difficulties seems almost to point to a Yankee strain in her blood."—*The Nation*.

THE HISTORY OF A SLAVE. By H. H. JOHNSTON, author of "The Kilimanjaro Expedition, etc. With 47 full-page Illustrations, engraved fac-simile from the author's Drawings. Large 12mo. Paper cover, 50 cents.

"'The History of a Slave' is a work of fiction based upon every-day occurrences in the Dark Continent, and well calculated to bring home to the reader the social condition of heathen and Mohammedan Africa, and the horrors of a domestic slave-trade."—*The Athenæum*.

THE MEMOIRS OF AN ARABIAN PRINCESS. By EMILY RUETE, *née* Princess of Oman and Zanzibar. Translated from the German. 12mo. Cloth, 75 cents.

The author of this amusing autobiography is half-sister to the late Sultan of Zanzibar, who some years ago married a German merchant and settled at Hamburg.

"A remarkably interesting little volume. . . . As a picture of Oriental court life, and manners and customs in the Orient, by one who is to the manor born, the book is prolific in entertainment and edification."—*Boston Gazette*.

SKETCHES FROM MY LIFE. By the late Admiral HOBART PASHA. With a Portrait. 12mo. Paper, 50 cents; cloth, \$1.00.

"The sailor is nearly always an adventurous and enterprising variety of the human species, and Hobart Pasha was about as fine an example as one could wish to see. . . . The sketches of South American life are full of interest. The sport, the inevitable entanglements of susceptible middies with beautiful Spanish girls and the sometimes disastrous consequences, the duels, attempts at assassination, and other adventures and amusements, are described with much spirit. . . . The sketches abound in interesting details of the American war."—*London Athenæum*.

ETHAN ALLEN. *The Robin Hood of Vermont.*
By HENRY HALL. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00.

The aim of the author has been to depict Allen's personality, and to throw some new light upon the character of one who has been often violently assailed. Allen's own letters have been freely drawn upon. The mass of material which has been examined has included matter not utilized before, and the result is an impartial and careful picture of Allen's associations, and habits of thought and action, which, it is believed, can not be neglected by Americans interested in the history of their own country.

"A spirited account of a forcible and influential character in our colonial and Revolutionary history. Ethan Allen certainly was a picturesque figure in his day, and his checkered career would afford a good foundation for a sensational novel."—*Congressionalist*.

"A welcome addition to American historical literature. The hero of Ticonderoga lives again in this graphic portrayal of the incidents and adventures of his eventful life. Ethan Allen is one of the most picturesque of the sturdy patriots of Revolutionary days. . . . Accurate to the last degree, and told in bright, telling language, the story should be widely read by the young, who may gather from the perusal of the book patriotic inspiration, and see how to live in touch with one's times and answer their demands."—*New York Observer*.

"Ethan Allen was not a polished drawing-room knight or a pious churchman. He swore terribly, and he was looked upon as a dangerous atheist. But no one now thinks of the manners or the piety of the man who, with eighty-three men, entered Fort Ticonderoga and summoned the British commander of the garrison to surrender."—*Philadelphia Bulletin*.

"A brief, sketchy, lively, entertaining biography of one of the most remarkable men in our early national history. . . ."—*Chicago Times*.

THE PRIVATE JOURNAL OF WILLIAM
MACLAY, *United States Senator from Pennsylvania, 1789-1791.* With Portrait from Original Miniature. Edited by
EDGAR S. MACLAY, A. M. Large 8vo. Cloth, \$2.25.

"In Mr. Maclay's time sessions of the Senate were held with closed doors, and the authentic records we have of its proceedings are meager. As Mr. Maclay's journal is concerned almost wholly with the proceedings of this body, its value as a record becomes very great. Students of the period must henceforth include it among their valuable sources of original information. The circumstances in which it was written give it peculiar value. Mr. Maclay wrote while his knowledge was still fresh and clear."—*New York Times*.

"So meager are the official reports of the doings of the first Congress after the adoption of the Constitution, that Mr. Maclay's journal must always be of great historical value. While Senator, he recorded in his journal each evening the proceedings of the day, and these records, many of them voluminous, give the book its value."—*New York Herald*.

"No elaborate book on the political and social status of a hundred years ago can begin to equal in interest the present one, with its daily fresh pictures—plainly projected upon the writer's journal for his own mental relief—of the bad manners and bad political and other morals of his fellow-legislators, such as leave to politicians of our day quite a balance often of propriety in any comparison that may be made. It is a mine as well of political faith and proposed practice in plain democratic methods, antedating nearly all the political doctrine that Jefferson is celebrated for as the founder of Jeffersonian, Madisonian, and Jacksonian Democracy."—*Brooklyn Eagle*.

ABRAMHAM LINCOLN: *The True Story of a Great LIFE.* By WILLIAM H. HERNDON and JESSE W. WEIK.

With numerous Illustrations. New and revised edition, with an introduction by HORACE WHITE. In two volumes. 12mo. Cloth, \$3.00.

This is probably the most intimate life of Lincoln ever written. The book, by Lincoln's law-partner, William H. Herndon, and his friend Jesse W. Weik, shows us Lincoln the man. It is a true picture of his surroundings and influences and acts. It is not an attempt to construct a political history, with Lincoln often in the background, nor is it an effort to apotheosize the American who stands first in our history next to Washington. The writers knew Lincoln intimately. Their book is the result of unreserved association. There is no attempt to portray the man as other than he really was, and on this account their frank testimony must be accepted, and their biography must take permanent rank as the best and most illuminating study of Lincoln's character and personality. Their story, simply told, relieved by characteristic anecdotes, and vivid with local color, will be found a fascinating work.

"Truly, they who wish to know Lincoln as he really was must read the biography of him written by his friend and law-partner, W. H. Herndon. This book was imperatively needed to brush aside the rank growth of myth and legend which was threatening to hide the real lineaments of Lincoln from the eyes of posterity. On one pretext or another, but usually upon the plea that he was the central figure of a great historical picture, most of his self-appointed biographers have, by suppressing a part of the truth and magnifying or embellishing the rest, produced portraits which those of Lincoln's contemporaries who knew him best are scarcely able to recognize. There is, on the other hand, no doubt about the faithfulness of Mr. Herndon's delineation. The marks of unflinching veracity are patent in every line."—*New York Sun*.

"Among the books which ought most emphatically to have been written must be classed 'Herndon's Lincoln.'"—*Chicago Inter-Ocean*.

"The author has his own notion of what a biography should be, and it is simple enough. The story should tell all, plainly and even bluntly. Mr. Herndon is naturally a very direct writer, and he has been industrious in gathering material. Whether an incident happened before or behind the scenes, is all the same to him. He gives it without artifice or apology. He describes the life of his friend Lincoln just as he saw it."—*Cincinnati Commercial Gazette*.

"A remarkable piece of literary achievement—remarkable alike for its fidelity to facts, its fullness of details, its constructive skill, and its literary charm."—*New York Times*.

"It will always remain the authentic life of Abraham Lincoln."—*Chicago Herald*.

"The book is a valuable depository of anecdotes, innumerable and characteristic. It has every claim to the proud boast of being the 'true story of a great life.'"—*Philadelphia Ledger*.

"Will be accepted as the best biography yet written of the great President."—*Chicago Inter-Ocean*.

"Mr. White claims that, as a portraiture of the man Lincoln, Mr. Herndon's work 'will never be surpassed.' Certainly it has never been equaled yet, and this new edition is all that could be desired."—*New York Observer*.

"The three portraits of Lincoln are the best that exist; and not the least characteristic of these, the Lincoln of the Douglas debates, has never before been engraved. . . . Herndon's narrative gives, as nothing else is likely to give, the material from which we may form a true picture of the man from infancy to maturity."—*The Nation*.

THE SOVEREIGNS AND COURTS OF EUROPE. The Home and Court Life and Characteristics of the Reigning Families. By "POLITIKOS." With many Portraits. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"A remarkably able book. . . . A great deal of the inner history of Europe is to be found in the work, and it is illustrated by admirable portraits."—*The Athenæum*.

"Its chief merit is that it gives a new view of several sovereigns. . . . The anonymous author seems to have sources of information that are not open to the foreign correspondents who generally try to convey the impression that they are on terms of intimacy with royalty."—*San Francisco Chronicle*.

"A most entertaining volume, which is evidently the work of a singularly well-informed writer. The vivid descriptions of the home and court life of the various royalties convey exactly the knowledge of character and the means of a personal estimate which will be valued by intelligent readers."—*Toronto Mail*.

"The anonymous author of these sketches of the reigning sovereigns of Europe appears to have gathered a good deal of curious information about their private lives, manners, and customs, and has certainly in several instances had access to unusual sources. The result is a volume which furnishes views of the kings and queens concerned, far fuller and more intimate than can be found elsewhere."—*New York Tribune*.

" . . . A book that would give the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth (so far as such comprehensive accuracy is possible), about these exalted personages, so often heard about but so seldom seen by ordinary mortals, was a desideratum, and this book seems well fitted to satisfy the demand. The author is a well-known writer on questions indicated by his pseudonym."—*Montreal Gazette*.

"A very handy book of reference."—*Boston Transcript*.

MY CANADIAN JOURNAL, 1872-'78. By LADY DUFFERIN, author of "Our Vice-Regal Life in India." Extracts from letters home written while Lord Dufferin was Governor-General of Canada. With Portrait, Map, and Illustrations from sketches by Lord Dufferin. 12mo. Cloth, \$2.00.

"A graphic and intensely interesting portraiture of out-door life in the Dominion, and will become, we are confident, one of the standard works on the Dominion. . . . It is a charming volume."—*Boston Traveller*.

"In every place and under every condition of circumstances the Marchioness shows herself to be a true lady, without reference to her title. Her book is most entertaining, and the abounding good-humor of every page must stir a sympathetic spirit in its readers."—*Philadelphia Bulletin*.

"A very pleasantly written record of social functions in which the author was the leading figure; and many distinguished persons, Americans as well as Canadians, pass across the gayly decorated stage. The author is a careful observer, and jots down her impressions of people and their ways with a frankness that is at once entertaining and amusing."—*Book-Buyer*.

"The many readers of Lady Dufferin's Journal of "Our Vice-Regal Life in India" will welcome this similar record from the same vivacious pen, although it concerns a period antecedent to the other, and takes one back many years. The book consists of extracts from letters written home by Lady Dufferin to her friends (her mother chiefly), while her husband was Governor-General of Canada; and describes her experiences in the same chatty and charming style with which readers were before made familiar."—*Cincinnati Commercial-Gazette*.

THE GILDED MAN (EL DORADO), and other
Pictures of the Spanish Occupancy of America. By A. F.
BANDELIER. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

The author here describes the adventures and romantic episodes attendant upon the early Spanish explorations of our Southwest. The scene of the story which gives its title to the volume is laid in Venezuela, and the legend of *El Dorado* is for the first time told accurately in popular form. With this exception the tales relate to our own country. They include the stories of the mysterious "Seven Cities of Cibola," "El Quivira," and others of equal dramatic interest and historical value.

WARRIORS OF THE CRESCENT. By W.
H. DAVENPORT ADAMS, author of "Battle Stories from English History," etc. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"A work without a rival in its particular field. . . . All the gorgeousness of the barbaric East invests this glowing pageant of kings and conquerors. . . . This is a remarkably able book in thought and in manner of presentation."—*Philadelphia Ledger*.

"A lively, carefully prepared chronicle of the careers of quite a number of the Mohammedan rulers in Asian regions who made their marks, one way or another, in the development of the peculiar civilization of the East. . . . This author has selected from the long chronicle the salients likely to be most interesting, and has obviously taken much pains to sift the fact carefully out of the rather confused mass of fact and fable in the Moslem chronicles."—*New York Commercial Advertiser*.

"Nowhere in history are there to be found such records of conquest, such frightful tales of blood, such overwhelming defeats or victories, as in the lives of the Asiatic sovereigns. . . . The author is a historian who tells his story and stops. He has done his work faithfully and well."—*Cincinnati Commercial Gazette*.

PICTURES FROM ROMAN LIFE AND STORY.
By Professor A. J. CHURCH, author of "Stories from Homer,"
"Stories from Virgil," etc. Illustrated. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"Prof. Church is a tried and approved master of the art of interesting young people in historical themes. The present work, while too thoughtful to be called strictly juvenile, treats of the great emperors and families of Rome in a simple narrative style certain to captivate youth and older people fond of historic lore."—*The Chautauquan*.

"In the thirty-six chapters comprised in the book there are as many stories, each begun and ended with the chapter. There are no long and tedious accounts. The reader gets the salient points of history. . . . Books of this kind have a special value by inducing young people into a love of historical reading and study."—*San Francisco Bulletin*.

"The material for these sketches is drawn partly from the inexhaustible riches of Plutarch, partly from contemporaneous history, and partly from letters, edicts, etc.; and, well chosen and briefly related, are interesting, whetting the appetite of the studiously inclined. . . . Various illustrations add to the interest of the work."—*Springfield Republican*.

"Each of the chapters presents some striking scene or personality in the period from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius. . . . Several of the chapters are thrown into the form of contemporary letters. The plan of the book is well conceived, and the subjects are those of general human interest."—*New York Critic*.

LIFE IN ANCIENT EGYPT AND ASSYRIA.

By G. MASPÉRO, late Director of Archæology in Egypt, and Member of the Institute of France. Translated by ALICE MORTON. With 188 Illustrations. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"A lucid sketch, at once popular and learned, of daily life in Egypt in the time of Rameses II, and of Assyria in that of Assurbanipal. . . . As an Orientalist, M. Maspero stands in the front rank, and his learning is so well digested and so admirably subdued to the service of popular exposition, that it nowhere overwhelms and always interests the reader."—*London Times*.

"Only a writer who had distinguished himself as a student of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities could have produced this work, which has none of the features of a modern book of travels in the East, but is an attempt to deal with ancient life as if one had been a contemporary with the people whose civilization and social usages are very largely restored."—*Boston Herald*.

A most interesting and instructive book. Excellent and most impressive ideas, also, of the architecture of the two countries and of the other rude but powerful art of the Assyrians, are to be got from it."—*Brooklyn Eagle*.

"The ancient artists are copied with the utmost fidelity, and verify the narrative so attractively presented."—*Cincinnati Times-Star*.

THE THREE PROPHETS: *Chinese Gordon; Mohammed-Ahmed; Araby Pasha*. Events before, during, and after the Bombardment of Alexandria. By Colonel CHAILLE-LONG, ex-Chief of Staff to Gordon in Africa, ex-United States Consular Agent in Alexandria, etc., etc. With Portraits. 16mo. Paper, 50 cents.

"Comprises the observations of a man who, by reason of his own military experience in Egypt, ought to know whereof he speaks."—*Washington Post*.

"The book contains a vivid account of the massacres and the bombardment of Alexandria. As throwing light upon the darkened problem of Egypt, this American contribution is both a useful reminder of recent facts and an estimate of present situations."—*Philadelphia Public Ledger*.

"Throws an entirely new light upon the troubles which have so long agitated Egypt, and upon their real significance."—*Chicago Times*.

THE MEMOIRS OF AN ARABIAN PRINCESS. By EMILY RUETE, *née* Princess of Oman and Zanzibar. Translated from the German. 12mo, Cloth, 75 cents.

The author of this amusing autobiography is half-sister to the late Sultan of Zanzibar, who some years ago married a German merchant and settled at Hamburg.

"A remarkably interesting little volume. . . . As a picture of Oriental court life, and manners and customs in the Orient, by one who is to the manner born, the book is prolific in entertainment and edification."—*Boston Gazette*.

"The interest of the book centers chiefly in its minute description of the daily life of the household from the time of rising until the time of retiring, giving the most complete details of dress, meals, ceremonies, feasts, weddings, funerals, education, slave service, amusements, in fact everything connected with the daily and yearly routine of life."—*Utica (N. Y.) Herald*.

THE STORY OF MY LIFE. By GEORG EBERS,
author of "Uarda," "An Egyptian Princess," "A Thorny Path,"
etc. With Portraits. 16mo. Cloth, \$1.25.

For many years Dr. Ebers has kept his hold upon the reading public and has strengthened it with every book. But the personality of this creator of the romance of the past has until now been veiled. The author here tells of his student life in Germany, his association with movements like that for the establishment of kindergarten training, his acquaintance with men like Froebel and the brothers Grimm, his experiences in the revolutionary period, his interest in Egyptology and the history of ancient Greece and Rome, and the beginnings of his literary career. It is a book of historical as well as personal interest.

"It is written with a charming frankness that is peculiarly German, and an appreciation of the incidents of his life that is peculiar to the novelist. Few of his stories afford more agreeable reading."—*New York Critic*.

"To those who know Dr. Ebers chiefly as an Egyptologist, and whose interest lies in his imaginative work, the early chapters of this autobiography will prove a source of illumination, for it is in them that we are let into the secrets of those experiences which not only molded his character, but were potent in shaping the bent of his mind."—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*.

"One of the most delightful books which Georg Ebers, the German Egyptologist and novelist, has written, and this is saying a great deal. . . . It is the picture of the life of a bright, active, happy boy in a German home of the most worthy sort, and at German schools mostly of conspicuous excellence. There is neither undue frankness nor superfluous reticence, but the things which one wishes to be told are recorded naturally and entertainingly."—*Boston Congregationalist*.

THE BRONTËS IN IRELAND. By Dr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. 12mo. Cloth.

This book presents a new and thrilling page in the family history of the Brontë sisters. It tells of foundling and the evil which he wrought to his benefactors; of an innocent child taken from his family, whom he never saw again, to a life of slavery; of the Homeric battles of Irish peasantry; and it pictures Charlotte Brontë's uncle as he prepared a new blackthorn and crossed to England to wreak Irish vengeance upon a malicious reviewer of "Jane Eyre." It is a book of absorbing interest.

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS OF WERNER VON SIEMENS. Translated by W. C. COUPLAND. 8vo. Cloth.

In two very different fields—the application of heat and the application of electricity—Herr von Siemens gained pre-eminent distinction by his rare combination of scientific insight and power of practical utilization of his knowledge. It was he—although Wheatstone and Varley's discoveries were simultaneous—who invented the dynamo-electric machine which became the basis of the modern Siemens-dynamo developed by Edison, Hopkinson, and others. He designed the ocean-cable ship Faraday; an electric railway, and an electric furnace were among others of his inventions; and in this day of electrical progress the autobiography of this great electrician will possess a pertinent and exceptional interest.

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 1, 3, & 5 Bond Street.

THE HISTORICAL REFERENCE-BOOK, comprising a *Chronological Table of Universal History*, a *Chronological Dictionary of Universal History*, a *Biographical Dictionary*. With Geographical Notes. For the use of Students, Teachers, and Readers. By LOUIS HEILPRIN. Fourth edition, revised and brought down to 1893. Crown 8vo. 569 pages. Half leather, \$3.00.

"One of the most complete, compact, and valuable works of reference yet produced."—*Troy Daily Times*.

"Unequaled in its field."—*Boston Courier*.

"A small library in itself."—*Chicago Dial*.

"An invaluable book of reference, useful alike to the student and the general reader. The arrangement could scarcely be better or more convenient."—*New York Herald*.

"The conspectus of the world's history is as full as the wisest terseness could put within the space."—*Philadelphia American*.

"We miss hardly anything that we should consider desirable, and we have not been able to detect a single mistake or misprint."—*New York Nation*.

"So far as we have tested the accuracy of the present work we have found it without flaw."—*Christian Union*.

"The conspicuous merits of the work are condensation and accuracy. These points alone should suffice to give the 'Historical Reference-Book' a place in every public and private library."—*Boston Beacon*.

"The method of the tabulation is admirable for ready reference."—*New York Home Journal*.

"This cyclopædia of condensed knowledge is a work that will speedily become a necessity to the general reader as well as to the student."—*Detroit Free Press*.


"For clearness, correctness, and the readiness with which the reader can find the information of which he is in search, the volume is far in advance of any work of its kind with which we are acquainted."—*Boston Saturday Evening Gazette*.


"The geographical notes which accompany the historical incidents are a novel addition, and exceedingly helpful. The size also commends it, making it convenient for constant reference, while the three divisions and careful elimination of minor and uninteresting incidents make it much easier to find dates and events about which accuracy is necessary. Sir William Hamilton avers that too retentive a memory tends to hinder the development of the judgment by presenting too much for decision. A work like this is thus better than memory. It is a 'mental larder' which needs no care, and whose contents are ever available."—*New York University Quarterly*.


A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY. Extending from the Earliest Times to the Year 1892. For the use of Students, Teachers, and Readers. By LOUIS HEILPRIN. 12mo. 200 pages. Cloth, \$1.25.

This is one of the three sections comprised in Heilprin's "Historical Reference-Book," bound separately for convenience of those who may not require the entire volume. Specimen pages sent on request.

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 1, 3, & 5 Bond Street.









LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 018 459 880 2